The Works of Bishop Grafton

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/worksofrtrevchar06grafiala

The Cathedral Edition

THE WORKS OF THE RT. REV. CHARLES C. GRAFTON, S.T.D., LL.D.

SECOND BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC

EDITED BY

B. TALBOT ROGERS, M.A., D.D.

WARDEN OF GRAFTON HALL, CANON OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, FOND DU LAC

IN EIGHT VOLUMES

VOLUME VI

MCMXIV

TO OUR ADORABLE LORD

AND ONLY SAVIOUR

JESUS CHRIST

THIS RECORD OF THE LIFE, LOVE AND WORKS

OF HIS DEVOTED SAINT

IS REVERENTLY INSCRIBED

Yours Very Faithfully -

+C.C. Fond du Lac

PLAIN SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVERENT CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION

FOND DU LAC TRACTS

BY

THE RIGHT REVEREND
CHARLES C. GRAFTON, S.T.D., LL.D.
BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC

NEW EDITION

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
LONDON, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS
1914

COPYRIGHT, 1897
BY JAMES POTT AND CO.

COPYRIGHT, 1914
BY LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

THE·PLIMPTON·PRESS
NORWOOD·MASS·U·S·A

CONTENTS

PAGE

PLAIN SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVERENT CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION 1

FOND DU LAC TRACTS

I. The Church in the New Testament 61
II. The Holy Eucharist in the New Testament . . 90
The Holy Communion: a Brief Exposition . . . 164
III. Catholicity and the Vincentian Rule 180
IV. Absolution in God's Word 230
Confession 279
V. Apostolic Succession 288
VI. Reunion of Oriental and Anglican Churches . . 325

The Rise of Ritualism in the Church 355

The Ritual of the Church 377

INDEX 385

PLAIN SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVERENT CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION
1898

THE following pages were written and published some twenty years ago, and at that time found favour with a number of the clergy. Since then a great many books have been written on the subject, giving elaborate details, full and particular, as to just how every part of the divine service is to be ordered. Such minute directions are useful to some; and the careful study of ritual as an exact science will always have a fascination for some minds. But there is a large number of the clergy, constantly increasing, who have neither the time nor the inclination to make a study of ritual, and who would not find places to put it in practice if they did. Yet there is a real desire for reverence, a desire to perform all priestly acts in an orderly manner and in conformity with ancient customs. To such this book will appeal. It is not a full directory of ritual, nor is it a book of private prayers. It simply gives sufficient directions for the fulfilment of the great priestly acts with reverence and edification. It is thought that nothing has been written which cannot be supported by competent Anglican authority.

PLAIN SUGGESTIONS

CHAPTER I

THE ALTAR

THE Book of Common Prayer, in the Institution Office, calls the holy table an altar. It should stand at the east end of the church and within the communion-rails. This part of the chancel is commonly called the sanctuary.

The reason why the Christian Church came to place its sanctuary, or holy of holies, at the east end of the building probably was to mark the distinction between the Christian and its forerunner the Jewish Church, which placed its sanctuary at the west end. The Jewish Church, it has been remarked, since it looked forward to the death of Christ, placed its holy of holies toward the setting sun. The Christian Church, built on the triumphant fact that Christ not only died but rose again, and the belief that He will come in glory, symbolizes her faith by building her churches toward the rising sun and placing her altars in the east.

As an architectural feature the altar may have a screen of either wood or stone, more or less ornamented, behind it. When from the size of the church the altar is somewhat large, it will be found

convenient to have a small space of some eighteen inches in width left between the screen, or reredos, and the altar, in order that persons engaged in the necessary work of cleaning or dusting the reredos, or arranging flowers upon it, may do so more conveniently.

The altar may be of wood or stone. There is no universal tradition in the Church as to the most appropriate material for the altar. While the practice of the Western portion of Christendom has been in favour of stone altars, the Eastern Church has preferred wood, as bringing out more significantly the idea of sacrifice and the offering upon the altar of the cross.

For the very practical reason that the priest may be the better heard, as well as the symbolical one of the ascent to Calvary, it is customary to raise the altar on one or more steps. Save in very small churches or chapels, three steps of from four to six inches in height will be found a convenient number. As the priest is obliged, by the directions of the Prayer-Book, for the most part to stand while engaged in the altar service, it is important that the altar should be of sufficient height to enable him, in a standing posture, easily to read the altar-book.

This matter demands attention, because in portions of the communion service both of the priest's hands are so occupied that he cannot take the book into them; and one cause of the not infrequent injury done to a clergyman's throat is his being often constrained to read in unnatural positions.

Three feet four to five inches is a good height for an altar. An altar lower than this will compel a priest of average stature to stoop inconveniently. Its length should be in proportion to the width of the sanctuary. The length varies from five feet and a half to twelve feet in American churches.

Often, but inaccurately, the term "superaltar" is applied to the shelf which runs along the back of the altar and rests upon it. Properly speaking, a superaltar is a small movable slab of stone, which is placed, as occasion for the celebration of the Holy Communion may require, upon some unconsecrated table or altar. There is no necessity for such an article among us, unless it be in a sick-room. It is, however, fit and seemly that nothing should be placed on that part of the altar where the consecration takes place save the vessels required for the celebration and the altar-book, from which the service is read; for although in pre-Reformation times candlesticks and other ornaments were frequently placed on the altar itself, yet a sense of reverence suggests some change from this mediæval usage. This propriety is secured by the shelf, or retable, as it is sometimes called, placed at the back of the altar, and upon which any needful ornaments may be placed.

The form of this altar-shelf resembles that of a box, of the same length as the altar, eight to ten inches broad and four to six inches high. There may also be shelves or ledges, as part of the reredos, for use in the fuller decorations of the sanctuary,

customary at Christmas and Easter and other festivals.

It may be observed that, for the most part, our altars are unnecessarily wide. Two feet or two feet three inches is considered as giving ample width. There is thus scarcely any existing altar upon which a retable may not be placed without any change in the present position of the altar, or trenching upon the space needed in the sanctuary.

Where there is an altar in a church too low and small for convenience and dignity, the fault can often easily be corrected, at little expense, by putting a base of a few inches in height under the altar, and by constructing a plain and simple reredos, which, by extending beyond the altar on either side and also partly enclosing it, will give to the old altar its required dignity. By this arrangement, where, as in some places, there are special associations connected with any existing altar, the feelings of devout persons will not be pained, as they might be by the removal of an old altar and the substitution of an entirely new one. Reasonable persons will rather be gratified by the care taken of and the beauty given to that which they have so cherished.

The Credence

In order that the priest may obey the rubric, before the prayer for Christ's Church militant, which requires of him, "*Then* [to] place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient,"

a small table or shelf, called a credence, is needed, upon which the elements can be placed before service, and remain until they are, by the priest, placed upon the altar.

It is a matter of common sense to put the credence where it has anciently been accustomed to stand, on the south side of the sanctuary. There is no mystical reason involved in this. It came about, probably, from the fact that the celebrant at the altar, when about to receive anything brought to him, naturally turns by the right. Then coming to the Epistle corner, he can more readily make use of his right hand in taking or receiving the elements which may be handed to him.

CHAPTER II

THE ALTAR ORNAMENTS

THE altar ordinarily has a covering, called an altar-cloth. For convenience, as well as for economy, it is usually divided into two parts. It is thus much easier to remove the altar-cloth when there is need of so doing, and it is more economical, as one portion, the upper one, can be used alone. This portion, which covers the top of the altar and hangs down in front nine or twelve inches, is called the superfrontal. It may be more or less embroidered, and is commonly finished with a fringe. The other portion, which is oftenest of

the same material, is known as the frontal, and falls to the ground, covering the entire front of the altar.

The Fair Linen Cloth

The rubric requires that the holy table, at the communion-time, shall have upon it a fair white linen cloth. This cloth, in order to fulfil the rubrical directions, should be as wide as the top of the altar. It is not directed to be any wider, but it may be considerably longer than the altar, so as to hang nearly half-way down on either end. As to its ornamentation, it is to be observed that the rubrical direction is not that it shall be "plain," that is, without any ornaments, but that it shall be "fair," that is, in the old English of the rubric, beautiful. The introduction, however, of any colour into its decoration seems forbidden by the order that, though "fair," it shall be "white." The fair linen cloth may therefore be enriched by having some designs embroidered upon it. Quite a common and simple one is the working of five crosses of the Greek shape upon it; one being placed in the centre, and one in each of the corners. The linen cloth is spread upon the altar as significant that the altar is also the holy table, whereon is celebrated the Supper of the Lord. The five crosses upon it are symbols of Christ's wounds, and appropriate to the evangelical truth that the sacrifice we feed upon is that of a Lamb that was slain.

The Cross

Opposition among all well-instructed Churchmen to the distinctive symbol of the Christian faith has passed away. The form of the cross can now be seen everywhere in our churches, in the form in which they are built, upon the spires and doors and windows, and adorning the font and chancel. The most fitting place, however, for it is the altar. It is not only our entrance into the Church that is wrought by the power of the cross, but our salvation from the beginning to the end depends upon Christ's grace and the merits of the Passion. This thought Christians should have constantly before them. It is therefore most fit that if the symbol of our redemption by Christ's death is to be used anywhere in our churches, it should be placed before us and over the altar, where is celebrated the "sacrament ordained," as the Catechism tells us, "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ."

Altar-Lights

In many churches where the chancels are dark the priest's labours will be greatly relieved and accidents to the sacrament be averted by placing lights upon the altar. The primitive custom is, however, so associated with the original institution, by our Blessed Lord, of the Holy Supper deep in the night, when lights were required, that their use has a most commemorative significance.

They are also emblematic of joy; as St. Jerome writes: "In all the churches of the East, when the Gospel is about to be read, lights are kindled, though the sun be shining brightly, not to put the darkness to flight, but to show a sign of rejoicing."

As emblematic of joy they are appropriate to the Holy Communion, and express the truth that it is a sacrifice "of praise and thanksgiving." Their use is, moreover, so interwoven with the entire history of the holy sacrament, with its primitive celebrations during ages of persecution, with its subsequent long-continued observance at early dawn, with the immemorial practice of all branches of the Church Catholic, Eastern and Western, Greek, Syrian, Coptic, Gothic, Celtic, that we weaken our claim of being primitive, apostolic, and Catholic in our usages if we neglect a custom of the Church of God so ancient and so universal. Used, as altar-lights are, by the Protestant churches in Germany, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, their use cannot rightly be said to symbolize any Roman doctrine. Commended by the original Anglican Reformers, their use cannot be said to be a revival of mediævalism, or contrary to the spirit of the Reformation, or to symbolize doubtful or erroneous doctrines. Continued in so many Anglican cathedrals, and by the wide-spread use of so many churches, the practice cannot be said to be contrary to the order of divine worship, as this Church hath received the same. Indeed, so far from tending toward Romanism or leading on to Rome, their general introduction and

use would do much to show that our Church is Catholic, though not papal, and to remove those prejudices which prevent so many Lutherans and Roman Catholics from joining us. It is, however, of higher importance to remember that by God's own appointment lights are the symbol of a sacred presence (Exod. x. 23, xiii. 21, 22, xxv. 31), and are found in the pattern for our worship revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai, and to St. John in the isle of Patmos (Rev. iv. 5; Heb. viii. 5). Moreover, the argument is not without force that as God, after He had led His people out of Egypt, took Moses up into the mount, so when God had led the Christian Church out of Judaism He took St. John up to heaven, and showed him the heavenly worship as the general model and directory, under the free power of the Spirit's guidance, of the worship of the Christian Church. There, in the midst of the divine glory, burning on forever in the eternal noonday, are the seven golden candlesticks and the seven lights before the throne.

Two lights are sufficient for a quiet, early celebration, but six are commonly used for a service accompanied with music.

CHAPTER III

THE ALTAR VESSELS

FOR the celebration of the Holy Communion a cup, or chalice, and a paten are required by the rubrics.[1] The large flagon sometimes seen in our churches is not mentioned in the Prayer-Book. The omission is not prohibition, unless all omissions are prohibitions, yet there seems but little need for it, as a properly constructed chalice will hold enough to communicate a hundred persons. If there are to be more than this number at a celebration, there may be two patens and chalices. Where it is possible, a priest will prefer to use but one set, as there is something to be said for the feeling that sees in the one chalice and paten a symbol of the truth that we are all partakers of one bread and one cup.

The paten should be made without any base, and so that it may fit into or safely rest upon the top of the chalice. This enables the vessels to be carried together. If the paten has any engraving upon it, it is better to place this on the lower side.

Besides the chalice and paten the following articles will be found convenient for the priest's use in the celebration:

[1] It is not commonly known that a clergyman may bring into the country a chalice and paten free of duty. Articles for the priest's use, which he wears on his person or carries in his hand, it has been ruled, are free from import duty.

The Purificator

A purificator is a small square of damask with a narrow hem, and having a cross marked in the middle. If made of common linen it should be of somewhat coarse quality, as better adapted to absorb water. Its size is determined by the width of the chalice-bowl, the diameter of which, being multiplied by three, will give the length of one side of the purificator. The purificator is folded the same way twice, and is so more ready for use. It is used by the priest to cleanse the sacred vessels at the end of the service. The purificators should be kept in some suitable place in the sacristy. It is a more reverent custom to have a fresh and clean purificator at each celebration than to use one several times.

The Pall

Another article of utility is the pall. It is a piece of cardboard six to eight inches square, covered with linen. One side is marked in the centre with a cross, which is the common sign placed on all articles used at the altar. The size is determined by the diameter of the paten, which it should entirely cover. The pall is used in the celebration to keep the chalice covered, and so prevent dust, flies, etc., from getting into it, and to protect it from other defilements.

The pall has a square of linen caught upon its under side by a stitch at each corner. This is so

placed as to be easy of removal in case the linen should by any chance become stained. A reverently disposed priest will take some proper measure to keep the rim of the chalice dry, but if the lining of the pall should ever become stained it should be removed and washed with befitting care, or burned.

The Chalice-Veil

As it is customary and seemly to cover the sacred vessels with a napkin or cloth of some kind, it is well to have one especially made and set apart for this purpose. This veil has come to be called the chalice-veil. It must not be confused with the thin lawn or fair linen one required by the rubric to cover the elements after the prayer of consecration. As the chalice-veil is used for a different purpose from that of the fair linen one, its different purpose is signified by its being made of a different material. The most serviceable material for the chalice-veil is silk, and of a size proportioned to the height of the sacred vessels. The size varies from twenty-one to twenty-three inches square. The veil is made more durable by being lined with silk, and may have an inner lining of linen. The sign of the cross is worked, not upon the centre, where it would be rubbed and worn, but in the middle of the lower third of the veil.

The use of the veil is to protect the sacred vessels while in the vestry and during the service before the communion, when the vessels are on

the credence, from dust, insects, and accidental injury.

The Communion-Veil

There are two other articles which may be mentioned. First the "fair linen cloth," or communion-veil, before alluded to, and directed in the rubric, the use of which is peculiar to our own Church. It is not found in the Roman rite, but was required by our Reformers, out of reverence for the sacrament. It should therefore not be laid aside, and the pall alone used, as is the habit with some, but rather cherished as a peculiarity of our Church. Symbolically it is said to signify the cloth which after the crucifixion was wound about our blessed Lord's body at His burial. As the Church bids us make it "fair," that is, beautiful, love and reverence will take care to make it as beautiful as it can be made.

The Corporal

Another article of utility is a square piece of linen called a corporal. It is placed when in use on the altar for the vessels to stand upon. It is useful, as will be seen by subsequent directions, for covering the paten during the communion, as the pall is needed for covering the chalice. It also, by the manner of its use, protects the chalice from the danger of being upset; and if crumbs get upon it, these are more easily gathered up (as it is movable) than if they fell upon the larger stationary linen

cloth. The size of it is about sixteen inches square. It is folded into a smaller square by being first folded one way twice, and then folded twice the opposite way. So folded, it is, along with the fair linen cloth or communion-veil, kept in a silk case called a burse.

The Burse

The burse is a case made of two squares of cardboard covered with silk, and joined together at the bottom, having the sides fastened together by a triangular piece of silk. The burse is open at the top. It thus forms a pocket or case which can be opened, within which the corporal and linen veil may be placed. It is about nine inches square, and may be adorned on one side with a cross of the same design as that on the chalice-veil, with which it corresponds in colour.

CHAPTER IV

THE VESTMENTS OF THE CELEBRANT

FROM an early date it has been the custom of the Christian Church for those set apart to minister in holy things to wear in divine service a distinctive dress. To distinguish the Holy Communion as the only service ordained by Christ Himself, an appropriate vestment has ever been worn by the priest officiating at the celebration of

it. One fact proves this. There are several historical churches which have possessed a continuous life since the Nicene era, namely, the Latin, the Orthodox Greek, the Syrian, the Coptic, the Armenian, and the Nestorian. The two former have been parted for nearly a thousand years. The four latter have been parted from one another and from the two former ever since the Council of Chalcedon, in A.D. 451. Any point on which they are agreed must therefore go back to the middle of the fifth century, and, unless there be some record of its formal introduction, must be part of their consentaneous tradition from a still earlier time. They all do agree in the use of specific eucharistic vestments. There are also written rubrical directions in one of the oldest extant forms of Christian liturgies (the Apostolic Constitutions), directing the celebrant to put on this vestment. Thus the use of distinctive vestments for the Holy Communion is not, as is sometimes ignorantly supposed, an imitation of Rome, but is a Catholic and primitive custom. This eucharistic dress, which was not only recognized but enjoined by the Reformers (the rubric regulating its use being still in the English Prayer-Book), consists of three principal pieces, namely, an under and an upper garment and a stole.

The under garment is of linen, and is called, from its white color, an alb. It is like a surplice. only with scantier folds and sleeves, and so better adapted than the surplice to be worn under another garment. Probably the present surplice is only

the amplification of the alb, and they are one and the same garment; the alb growing into the more ample Anglican surplice, or shrinking into the Italian form, because used alone. The common sense of the matter is this: that one portion of this clerical dress, called a surplice when used alone, is worn in saying Morning and Evening Prayer; but when the highest act of Christian worship is performed it is but fit that the priest should be *fully* vested, that is, should wear the upper garment, or chasuble, over his under one, then called an alb. It is to be remembered, however, that this dress cannot fairly be forced into having further doctrinal significance than already belongs to the surplice. The surplice, or alb, is a vestment, as all the contentions of the English Puritans show, identified in the popular mind with the idea of priesthood, and the chasuble is no more a sacerdotal garb than it. It was the recognition of this fact that led to the Surplice Riots in London many years ago, when the academical black gown was discarded in the pulpit, and the clergy took to preaching in the surplice. If one may use the analogy of an earthly army and its terms, it has seemed to the Church more becoming that the priest should, when he comes to celebrate the one service ordained by Christ Himself, be in full uniform.

The alb has for practical purposes a movable collar, which is a small oblong piece of linen called an amice. It can be more often washed and changed than the alb, and its object is to pro-

tect the stole and chasuble from being soiled about the neck, and is put on in such a way as to fulfil this purpose.

The alb is usually made somewhat long, in order to be usable by all the clergy connected with or visiting a church. It is adjusted to the height of the individual wearing it by a girdle, which also is used to keep the stole in its place. The chasuble, or upper garment of the primitive form, is of a circular or oval shape, having no opening, save one in the centre for the head.

The origin of these two parts of the clerical vesture, the alb and the chasuble, has been much investigated by German and English writers of late years. Some assert that they are derived from the vestments of the Jewish priests, others that they are derived from the dress of the Roman citizen. The better opinion seems to be that the dress is of Eastern origin, and was the ordinary garb used by Our Lord and His apostles. Their own dress would, of course, be worn by the apostles into whatever part of the world they went; and would continue to be used, through the conservative spirit of the early Church, as the church vestments, amid the various changes of different national costumes. These vestments, having come down to us, help to mark the continuity of our Church with the Church of primitive times. They are part of our rightful inheritance as Christians and Catholics. They are sanctioned by the usage and order of our Reformers. They are by their primitive form and

design a constant and visible protest against Romanism and its modern ways. Various symbolical meanings have been invented by wise and unwise minds respecting these vestments. It is as free for any one now as ever to give any spiritual meaning to any one of the garments as may be of help to himself. It is probable that the general style of dress is the same as the one worn by the Lord; it may remind us of Him as the one High Priest.

The material of the chasuble may be of linen or silk, but the latter is preferable. If our Church's order of received worship allows the use of the black silk gown in the pulpit, there is no reason why a silk one of white or any other colour may not be worn in honour of our Lord at the altar.

As the chasuble is the special eucharistic vestment, it should not be worn at any other service.

CHAPTER V

HOW TO PREPARE FOR THE CELEBRATION

IN the vestry, or sacristy, the vessels are prepared in this manner: A simple linen covering is spread upon some suitable shelf or table. Upon this is placed the chalice. A purificator is laid across the top of it. Upon the purificator is then placed the paten, which is nearly flat, and so can rest safely upon it. Upon the paten, in churches where wafer-bread is used, it is customary to place

a single large wafer. Over this is laid the pall, and then over all the silk chalice-veil is spread. Lastly, the burse, containing within it the corporal and the fair linen veil, is laid on top. In the church, upon the credence, should be placed two cruets, one holding wine, the other water. If there is to be a very large number of communicants, the wine may be in the flagon, but glass is a better and cleaner material than metal for the purpose of holding wine. The kind of bread, whether leavened or unleavened, our Church does not regard as an essential matter. The kind and form used have no doctrinal significance. But bread in a wafer form, because always ready for use and never crumbling, is more convenient for both priest and people. It may also be said to appertain to reverence, as separate from common use. It is, moreover, most probably the same kind of bread used by our Lord at the institution of the Holy Communion, and known as Passover bread now. It is used by the Lutherans and in the Swedish churches. The altar-bread or wafers will be placed in some suitable vessel, which either has a cover or is covered with some linen cloth. If there is to be an offering of money a decent basin to receive it will be placed on the credence, and not on the altar. The altar will have upon it the fair linen cloth, which falls two or more feet at either end, but does not show in front. When the celebrations are very frequent, it is sometimes left upon the altar. It is then protected from dust by a temporary covering of some common stuff, which

is removed before the celebration. The altar should have a book-rest upon it. When the priest is without an assistant, the altar service-book will be placed closed upon the book-rest before the service begins.

If Morning Prayer is not to precede the communion, the priest should bring in the vessels when he comes to celebrate. Where Morning Prayer precedes the communion, he may place the vessels upon the altar before service. In this case he will take the corporal out of the burse and spread the corporal, and then place the sacred vessels upon it, still covered with the chalice-veil.

The priest vests himself in the sacristy, or vestry, the latter and more customary term better denoting the place where the vestments are kept. The vestments needed for the celebration, where there is room for the purpose, may be conveniently laid out for the priest in the following order on some table:

The chasuble, with the lower half of its two sides turned up, so that, being laid down flat, the exterior is protected from any dust which might be on the table, and the garment is more easily put on by the priest. Upon it are laid the maniple and the stole. The girdle, having been doubled, is placed upon them. Then the alb is laid over them, so folded as to be more readily put on. And lastly the amice is laid on the top. The priest, having washed his hands, then vests himself in the following manner, with cassock, amice, alb, girdle, stole, maniple, and

chasuble. The cassock, it may be here observed, though now much discarded for the purpose, is as much a home or secular garb as a church one, and therefore has not been previously mentioned. The amice is the first piece put on. It is first placed on the top of the head, the two long strings attached to it hanging down in front. The strings are crossed on the breast and then passed round the body and brought to the front, where they meet and are tied in a bow-knot. The alb is then put on, and next the girdle. The girdle is passed round the waist and brought to the front, where its two ends are passed through the loop which is made by the girdle's having been doubled, and is so secured. Next the stole is placed over the neck. The amice is now allowed to drop down and form a collar covering the stole and preventing its getting soiled. The stole, if the celebrant is a bishop, hangs straight on either side, but if the celebrant is a priest it is crossed on the breast. It is kept in its place by the girdle, the lower portions of which were hanging in front, and are now brought to either side of the body. The maniple is worn on the left arm; and lastly the chasuble is put on.

As the act of vesting soon becomes a mechanical one, the priest may profitably say during the process a few prayers. The following, or others of one's own selection, can be used. They can either be learned by heart or copied out and hung up before the priest in the place where he is accustomed to vest.

Prayers while Vesting for the Holy Communion

At washing the Hands

Cleanse me, O Lord, from all defilement of heart and body, that I may with clean hands and a pure heart fulfil Thy work.

At putting on the Amice

Cover, O Lord, my head with the helmet of Thy salvation, that, the assaults of the evil one being repelled, in peace I may offer this service to Thee.

At putting on the Alb

Cleanse me, O Lord, that, made white and washed in the blood of the Lamb, I may serve Thee faithfully, and at last attain to everlasting joy.

At putting on the Girdle

Gird me, O Lord, with the girdle of Thy love, and extinguish within me the fire of all evil desire, that the grace of temperance and chastity may abide in me.

At putting on the Stole

Grant me so to bear Thy yoke and minister in Thy name that Thy word may never return to Thee void, but may fulfil that to which Thou sendest it.

At putting on the Maniple

Grant me so to bear the present burden of labour and sorrow that for love of Thee it may be light, and I may persevere even unto the end.

At putting on the Chasuble

Clothe me, O Lord, with the robe of Thy righteousness, that trusting only in Thy merits, and resting in Thy love, all that I do may be acceptable to Thee.

(It may be observed that the ancient English use of Sarum directed the priest to say the hymn *Veni Creator* while he was robing himself in the sacred vestments.)

OTHER PRAYERS THAT MAY BE SAID

O merciful Lord, incline Thine ear to our prayers, and enlighten our souls by the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may worthily celebrate Thy holy mysteries and love Thee with an everlasting love.

Inflame our hearts, O Lord, we beseech Thee, with the fire of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may serve Thee with chaste bodies, and please Thee with pure souls.

Visit, we pray Thee, O Lord, and cleanse our consciences, that Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ

may, when He cometh, find in us a mansion fitted for His abode.

O God, who in this wonderful sacrament hast left unto us a memorial of Thy passion, grant us so to venerate the sacred mysteries of Thy body and blood that we may always perceive in ourselves the fruit of Thy redemption.

CHAPTER VI

THE EASTWARD POSITION

OUR churches, according to an old custom, usually stood east and west, with the chancel turned toward the east. It is no longer possible in cities to observe this custom. But in consequence of it, the chancel end is often technically called the east end, no matter in what point of the compass it stands.

The altar now ordinarily stands at the farther end of the chancel, and close to the wall, or its reredos, which rises behind it.

To stand before the long side of the altar, and to face the reredos, is what is called the eastward position.

That the priest is to stand while saying the consecration prayer has never been questioned. But it has been questioned whether he should stand not only when consecrating, but when he receives

the communion. The rubric says that the priest shall first receive the communion in both kinds himself, and after that proceed to deliver the same to the people, into their hands, "all devoutly kneeling." The "all" who are here bidden to kneel surely does not include the priest. For if the "all kneeling" in the rubric applied to the priest, it would force him to go round the chancel delivering the sacrament on his knees. It, then, applies only to the people. Concerning himself, the rubric has told him to stand before the altar when he is consecrating, and gives him no direction to kneel when he receives. It leaves him in a standing position. To many who have been accustomed to kneel it may seem the more reverent way. But standing is as sacred a position in prayer as kneeling, and in receiving as well as offering the priest is acting, not as an individual, but in an official capacity. He officially completes the great transaction by partaking of the sacrifice he has offered. And this growing practice among us of receiving standing appears to have the sanction of the House of Bishops. In the direction given by them, in 1832, the priest, on account of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, is always to stand, save where he is expressly bidden to kneel. According to this direction, he will therefore kneel only at the confession and the prayer of humble access. He will not kneel at his silent prayer of preparation at the beginning of the service, nor at the prayer for Christ's Church militant, nor when receiving the sacred elements. But

as no one would wish to check reverence and devotion, the two ideas might well be combined by the priest, after receiving each kind in his official standing position, kneeling down for a brief moment for his own private prayer and act of homage.

The next point, *where* the priest is to stand at the time of the consecration, is one of more difficulty. The Reformers of the sixteenth century placed no direction in the Prayer-Book concerning it. But it led to great confusion and bitter contest in the times of Laud and the Stuarts, when party feeling ran high; and in the time of the Puritan Commonwealth, Dr. Wren was accused and tried for consecrating in the midst of the altar, which he contended was the place, where he, being short of stature, and so not able without awkwardness to reach over from the north end to the elements, could with more readiness and decency break the bread before the people.

When, in 1662, he, with others, had the opportunity and power given them to determine this matter, they did it by placing in the Prayer-Book our present rubric. The traditional interpretation of this rubric in America, affected, perhaps, by the Scottish custom, has been to place the priest in the eastward position. It has not been considered much of a party matter. There have been differences, but this eastward position has been the more common practice. Some few clergymen have gone behind the altar and faced the people, which is the position we take in our pulpits when preaching to them.

Some have gone to one end of the altar and thus separated themselves from the people by taking an attitude toward the altar different from them. Now and then this north-end position has been defended by very high Churchmen, who have adopted it, as liturgically correct, because it was at the north end of the altar, in the Jewish rite, that the victim was slain. But most commonly the priest has been content to take the same position toward the altar that the people take toward it, and to stand, as they do, before it. To the objection that the priest is thus standing with his back toward the people, it is a sufficient answer that he is doing not otherwise than the priest in the front pew is doing to the priest in the pew behind him; for all the baptized and confirmed are sharers, in their degree, in the priesthood. Our church people have accepted the eastward position as the common-sense construction of the rubric. So it has come to pass that what is called the eastward position has been commonly adopted in America.

But it is well to note that this position is in strict conformity with the directions of the rubric. The object of the new rubric was to settle the old dispute and determine the exact position of the clergyman at this point of the service. Consequently the rubric must be strictly construed in conformity with that intention. It declares that the priest is to stand "before the table."

Now the phrase "before the table" may have two meanings. First, it may mean "in the presence

of." Let us suppose, for the sake of the investigation, that it has this sense. What follows? Every square or oblong table has four sides. If the words "before the table" means "in the presence of," then the directions of the rubric would be fulfilled at whichever one of the four sides of the table the priest might stand. At any side he would be in the presence of the table. But this would not be to construe the rubric in accordance with its intention and purpose. On the contrary, it would destroy its force as giving a precise direction as to position. It would allow every clergyman to do as he pleased. "Before the table" must therefore mean some one side of the table. This, we think, must be admitted. Which side, then, is it? Behind the table, or at one of the ends, or in front of it?

The Prayer-Book determines this by using the term "before" a second time in the same rubric. The priest must also stand "before the people," as well as "before the table." This gives us the clue to the true construction of the rubric. For, according to the rules of legal construction, a technical term in one clause of a law or rubric must have the same signification given to it as in any other part of the same rubric or law. In the latter use of the term, therefore, it cannot, any more than in the former use of it, mean "in the presence of" or "in the sight of the people." Here, as previously, it must be construed to designate the side where he is to stand. Regarding the people, as the rubric does, as a body

of worshippers in the church, it cannot mean by the term "before" in their presence or sight, but must mean here, as it did when the term was previously used, at some one side of the people. If at some one side, three sides are excluded. Which are the three excluded sides?

Let us see. Clearly "before the people" does not mean behind or in the rear of the people, or at either end or on one of the flanks, but "before" here means, and can only mean, standing out in advance or in front of them. Seeing, then, that "before" means one side, it must here mean the side in front of the people.

Now let us go back to the first phrase, "before the table," and apply to it what we have learned. By the law of legal construction, similar words in the same rubric must mean the same thing. Consequently "before the table" must mean what we have seen "before the people" means. Since the latter means in front of the people, so the former must mean in front of the table. Is it asked, Which is the front of the table? The rubric has provided an answer. According to the rubric, the people and the table are the two sole objects by which the priest's position is to be determined. These were put in the rubric for that purpose. Now these two objects face each other. The people face the table, and the table faces the people. The people front toward the table; the front of the table is that side which is toward the people. The priest must therefore so stand before the table as to be before the

people, and before the people as to be before the table. The rubric orders him to stand "before the people," i.e., in front of them, and "before the table," i.e., in front of it as it faces the people. It puts him between the two.

We can imagine an objector standing at one end of the table, claiming to be in front of the people. So far, so good. But in this case he is not before or in front of the *table*. To fulfil the rubric, he must be both at the same time. He might argue, and probably a good many honest-minded men do, that the table fronts him. Granted; but he, by his *action*, is not to determine which is the front. This is to place himself above the Church, and not make himself, as both bishop and priest are bound to do, the Church's humble and obedient servant. This is not to seek for and be governed by the mind of the Church, as a loyal Anglican Churchman should, but to seek to force his mind and ways upon her. No matter how low a Churchman, he ought to feel that the Church is wiser than himself; and no matter how high a Churchman, that the Church he has sworn to be obedient to is higher than he. For any one to say, when he stands at the so-called north end or south end, that he faces the altar, and the altar faces him, may be granted. But he, by his own action, is not to determine which is the front of the altar. This were to make his action control the rubric, not the rubric control and direct him. The Church, by the rubric, orders the priest where he is to stand; and the two and only objects

by which the rubric determines the priest's position are the table and the people. They front each other; and the priest is ordered to stand "before the people," i.e., as they face the table, and "before the table," as it faces the people.

So far, then, as our examination of the rubric has gone, it places the priest between these two objects. This is the result of an honest and loyal attempt to know what the rubric means, irrespective of any theological or party considerations. But thus far the rubric does not say how the priest, standing between the two, is to face. It does not force him to face the people or the table. It merely, by an honest construction, puts him between the two. Nor does it determine whether he is to stand nearer the table or nearer to the people. These two further points are yet to be determined.

But the framers of this rubric of 1662 had been through a terrible and painful experience in this matter, and were not likely to omit any direction needful for the complete determination of the priest's position. They therefore so worded the rubric as to force the priest to stand near the table, and to face it, by commanding him so to arrange or order the bread and wine that he may with more readiness break the bread and take the cup into his hands. These directions placed him close to the altar, and with his back to the people. They, moreover, used the words with which Wren had defended himself before the Puritans, and declared that in this position he could with "more readiness and

decency break the bread before the people." There is nothing in the history of the time or in the rubric to give colour to the absurd notion that "before the people" meant that the people should be able to see the manual actions, or that any one ever supposed that it was important they should do so. The ancient way of standing was, in the mind of those who finally revised the Prayer-Book, the "decent" way.

Thus carefully and thoughtfully was a rubric framed by the Reformers in 1662, after their sad experience with the Puritans, who used to move the holy table about in divine service to suit their own sacrilegious notions — a rubric which, by determining the priest's position, not by an easily avoided reference to the points of the compass, or by designating by name any side of the table, but by fixing the priest's position solely by reference to the table and the people, placed the priest between the two, near the holy table, with his back to the people, and so secured, however the table might be turned or placed, the ancient position of the priest at the time of the consecration.

Surely every minister loyal to the Anglican communion, believing in the continuity of our Church, will take this position, in obedience to the Church's order, in the furtherance of unity among ourselves, and as one assertion of our ancient heritage, and so far a protest against the exclusive claims of Rome.

CHAPTER VII

THE ORDER OF THE SERVICE

THE following suggestions are for a plain celebration, where there is but a single priest. Being vested, and the vessels having been prepared as before described, the priest takes the chalice by the knob with his left hand, and, putting the fingers of his right on the burse, proceeds to the altar. He ascends to the middle of the altar, and places the sacred vessels a little on one side in order to leave room for the spreading of the corporal. He then takes off the burse and takes out of it the corporal and veil. He places the burse on the Gospel side, standing it up against the retable. He places the communion-veil, still folded, on the Epistle side, and then unfolds the corporal and spreads it on the altar, and places upon it the sacred vessels, still covered by the silk veil. He then goes to the altar-book and opens it. The altar-book usually lies on a stand, or book-rest. He returns to the centre and goes down the steps, and then, turning to the altar, says his private prayer. The Forty-third Psalm is a suitable devotion here, and is frequently used. He says all this standing, upon the general principle given by the House of Bishops in their published resolutions in regard to the posture of the officiating priest. They declared that, "as the Holy Communion is of a spiritually sacrificial character, the *standing* posture should be observed by

him whenever that of kneeling is not expressly prescribed, to wit, in *all parts*, including the ante-communion and the postcommunion, except the confession and the prayer immediately preceding the prayer of consecration."

After this short private prayer the priest ascends to the middle of the altar and goes, according to the rubric, to the "right side." This does not mean to one of the ends of the altar, but to the right side of the "midst," or middle, of the altar. The American book has changed the old confusing direction of "north side," as it stood in the English book, to "right side"; and interpreting the Prayer-Book by the Prayer-Book, we learn which the right side is. The rubric in the marriage service, "standing together, the Man on the right hand," etc., seems to show that the "right side" means the Epistle side. Anyway, facing the altar, the Epistle side is on the right side, and this is the common-sense construction. Moreover, going to the Epistle side at the beginning involves less subsequent change of posture.

The priest then says the Lord's Prayer and the Collect for Purity. He then goes to his normal place, which is the middle of the altar, and, turning to the people, recites the Ten Commandments or the Summary of the Law. It is well that he should do this without a book. If he says only the Summary of the Law he will turn, of course, to the altar to recite the Kyries. Then he goes to the Epistle side, and says there the collect for the day and reads

the Epistle. After the Epistle he goes over to the Gospel side and reads the Gospel. Then he returns to his normal place in the middle of the altar and recites the Creed; and here he remains, save when going for the elements and communicating the people, throughout the rest of the service.

After the Creed he shall begin the offertory by saying one of the appointed texts and by uncovering the sacred vessels. He takes off the silk veil, and folding it once, lays it on the Epistle side. He then places the pall upon it. He takes the paten and goes to the Epistle corner of the altar to receive the bread. If he has no assistant to bring the elements from the credence, it would be well to place them within easy reach on the Epistle side. After this the priest returns to the middle of the altar, and places the paten with the bread in it upon the corporal, in such position that he may turn over upon the paten the righthand corner of the corporal. He then takes the chalice, and, the purificator being on it, he wipes out the chalice-bowl. Then he carries the chalice to the corner of the altar, and takes the cruet and pours into the chalice a sufficient quantity of wine, and then, if the universal practice of the primitive Church is observed, pours in also a very small quantity of water. The chalice is then brought and placed on the corporal behind the paten, and is covered with the pall. It will be found convenient for its further use now to place on top of the pall, unfolded, the fair linen communion-veil.

From this point in the service the priest will take care that the chalice and paten, when not in use, are always covered with the pall and corporal. The alms having been presented, the priest turns from the right to the left toward the people, and, extending his hands, says: "Let us pray," etc.; and then, continuing to turn in the same direction, he completes a circle, and facing again the altar, he begins the prayer for Christ's Church militant. There is no other reason connected with this movement than that the circle typifies the whole world and Christians everywhere. The priest continues the service according to the direction of the Prayer-Book.

Here we may note that in saying collects, and during the preface, and at the beginning of the consecration, the hands are separated and held facing each other, the elbows resting naturally at the sides. This ancient custom probably comes from St. Paul's direction that men should pray "lifting up holy hands." In kneeling down at the prayer of humble access, it is well to contract the habit of putting the hands on the altar on either side, or under the corporal; by so doing the danger of upsetting the chalice is avoided. On coming to the consecration, the priest uncovers the paten and chalice. They are uncovered for the consecration and invocation, and then are usually covered during the rest of the prayer.

In communicating the people it is easier for the priest to commence on the Epistle side, so that,

holding the paten with his left hand, he is more free to distribute from the paten with his right.

Care should be taken to remove any drops which may adhere to the edge of the chalice. After the communion of the people, the chalice is placed in the middle of the corporal. The priest places next the paten upon the chalice, and on the paten the pall, and unfolding the communion-veil, spreads it over the pall.

After the blessing the priest reverently receives the sacrament remaining. Then, if alone, he goes to the Epistle corner of the altar, takes the wine-cruet, and pours a little wine into the chalice, and having consumed the wine, a little water and wine is poured into the chalice over the fingers of the priest. Sometimes water also is poured upon the paten, which is afterwards emptied into the chalice, and then the priest drinks the whole. The chalice and paten are next wiped with the purificator, which is left in the chalice-bowl. The chalice is then placed in the middle of the corporal, the paten placed upon the chalice, then the pall laid on the paten, and the whole covered with the silk veil. The vessels so covered are moved a little to the Epistle side, and the corporal and communion-veil are folded. The burse is then taken from the retable, and the corporal and communion-veil are put in it, and the burse is laid on the top of the silk chalice-veil as it was when it was brought from the vestry. The priest closes the altar-book, and takes the sacred vessels, and in the same manner

in which he brought them to the altar returns to the vestry.

It will greatly tend to the devotion of the people and their more frequent attendance if the priest will study to say the service reverently in manner, quietly and steadily in tone, with moderate rapidity of utterance, with dexterous economy of time at the offertory, without pauses for the introduction of his own private prayers. The service, with a dozen to communicate, can be said with great reverence and devotion, and without any sign of haste, in from twenty-five to thirty minutes. The priest will make, after the celebration, his thanksgiving to God before leaving the church.

CHAPTER VIII

PREPARATION AND THANKSGIVING

IT is the custom of many devout priests to say an office of preparation immediately before vesting for the celebration. This habit is recommended. The few minutes spent quietly before the altar will be found most helpful as a means of recollection. The thought of his own unworthiness and the dignity of his high calling will help to prepare the priest for the accomplishment of his Master's command, "Do this." For such a purpose the following devotions are often used.

Office of Preparation

I will fear no evil. Psalm 84

O how amiable are Thy dwellings: Thou Lord of hosts!

My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God.

Yea, the sparrow hath found her an house, and the swallow a nest, where she may lay her young: even Thy altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God.

Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house: they will be alway praising Thee.

Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee: in whose heart are Thy ways.

Who going through the vale of misery use it for a well: and the pools are filled with water.

They will go from strength to strength: and unto the God of gods appeareth every one of them in Sion.

O Lord God of hosts, hear my prayer: hearken, O God of Jacob.

Behold, O God our defender: and look upon the face of Thine anointed.

For one day in Thy courts: is better than a thousand.

I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God: than to dwell in the tents of ungodliness.

For the Lord God is a light and defence: the Lord

will give grace and worship, and no good thing shall He withhold from them that live a godly life.

O Lord God of hosts: blessed is the man that putteth his trust in Thee.

Glory be to the Father, etc.

I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me. Thou hast prepared a table before me against them that trouble me: Thou hast anointed my head with oil, and my cup shall be full.

In Penitential Seasons

Remember not, Lord, etc. PSALM 130

Out of the deep have I called unto Thee, O Lord: Lord, hear my voice.

O let Thine ears consider well: the voice of my complaint.

If Thou, Lord, wilt be extreme to mark what is done amiss: O Lord, who may abide it?

For there is mercy with Thee: therefore shalt Thou be feared.

I look for the Lord; my soul doth wait for Him: in His word is my trust.

My soul fleeth unto the Lord: before the morning watch, I say, before the morning watch.

O Israel, trust in the Lord, for with the Lord there is mercy: and with Him is plenteous redemption.

And He shall redeem Israel: from all his sins.

Glory be to the Father, etc.

Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers; neither take Thou vengeance of our sins.

Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.

Our Father, etc.

I said, Lord, have mercy upon me:
Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee.
Turn us then, O God our Saviour:
And let Thine anger cease from us.
O Lord, let Thy mercy be showed upon us:
As we do put our trust in Thee.
Let Thy priests be clothed with righteousness:
And let Thy saints sing with joyfulness.
Cleanse Thou me from my secret faults:
Keep Thy servant also from presumptuous sins.
Lord, hear my prayer:
And let my cry come unto Thee.

May the fire of the Holy Spirit, O Lord, cleanse our hearts and reins, that we may serve Thee with a chaste body and pure heart; through Jesus Christ. Amen.

O Lord, we beseech Thee, visit and cleanse our consciences, that Thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, may, when He cometh, find in us a dwelling-place prepared for Him, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

Almighty, Everlasting God, lo! I draw near to

the sacrament of Thy only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. I come sick to the Physician of life, unclean to the Fountain of mercy, blind to the Light of eternal brightness, poor and needy to the Lord of all things. I pray Thee, therefore, to wash my defilements, to enlighten my blindness, to enrich my poverty, to clothe my nakedness; that I may receive the true Bread of Angels, the King of kings and Lord of lords, with a humble, lowly, and contrite heart, with a lively faith in Thy mercy, and a pure desire to do Thy will. Grant, I beseech Thee, that I may receive not only the sacrament of the true body and blood of our Lord, but also the full benefit of the sacrament. O most gracious God, grant me so to receive the body of Thy only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that I may be made perfectly one with His holy body the Church. O most loving Father, grant unto me that, as I desire here to receive Him veiled from sight, so I may hereafter behold Him face to face, where with Thee, O Father, and Thee, O Holy Ghost, He liveth and reigneth, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

The grace of our Lord, etc.

As silent communing with God is useful before celebrating the divine mysteries, so it will be found helpful after the service is finished and the vestments have been removed. Again to approach the altar and in silence to meditate upon the great thing which God has wrought by the hand of His minister

will increase humility and gratitude. The unseemly haste with which both priest and people so frequently leave the house of God at the conclusion of a service is hardly suggestive of *love* for His habitation, the place where His honour dwelleth. The sight of the priest returning to the altar to make his thanksgiving is certain to have its effect upon his people, and soon they will be seen to linger on their knees in grateful homage for the Bread of Angels which they have received. The following office of thanksgiving is suggested as one in common use.

Office of Thanksgiving

To be Said in Church or during the Day

Let us sing the Song of the Three Children:

O all ye Works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O ye Angels of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O ye Children of Men, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O let Israel bless the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O ye Priests of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O ye Servants of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O ye Spirits and Souls of the Righteous, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O ye holy and humble Men of heart, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

O Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, bless ye the Lord: praise Him, and magnify Him forever.

Glory be to the Father, etc.

Psalm 150. *Laudate Dominum*

O praise God in His holiness: praise Him in the firmament of His power.

Praise Him in His noble acts: praise Him according to His excellent greatness.

Praise Him in the sound of the trumpet: praise Him upon the lute and harp.

Praise Him in the cymbals and dances: praise Him upon the strings and pipe.

Praise Him upon the well-tuned cymbals: praise Him upon the loud cymbals.

Let everything that hath breath: praise the Lord.

Glory be to the Father, etc.

Nunc Dimittis (*Song of Simeon*)

Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace: according to Thy word.

For mine eyes have seen: Thy salvation,

Which Thou hast prepared: before the face of all people;

To be a light to lighten the Gentiles: and to be the glory of Thy people Israel.

Glory be to the Father, etc.

Let us sing the Song of the Three Children: which they sang as they blessed the Lord in the furnace of fire.

Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.

Our Father, etc.

Let all Thy works praise Thee, O Lord:
And Thy saints give thanks unto Thee.
Thy saints shall exult in glory:
They shall rejoice in their beds.
Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us:
But to Thy Name give the glory.
Lord, hear my prayer:
And let my cry come unto Thee.

O God, who didst to the three children soothe the flames of fire, mercifully grant that the flames of sin may not kindle upon us Thy servants.

Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings with Thy most gracious favour, and further us with Thy continual help; that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy Name, and finally by Thy mercy obtain everlasting life.

Grant us, O Lord, we beseech Thee, grace to quench the flames of our sins as Thou didst endue the Blessed Laurence with power to overcome the fire of his torments; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

We yield Thee thanks, O Lord, holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, who for no merits of

ours, but of the condescension of Thy mercy only, hast vouchsafed to feed us sinners, Thine unworthy servants, with the precious body and blood of Thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. We pray Thee that this holy communion may not bring guilt upon us to condemnation, but may be unto us for pardon and salvation. Let it be to us an armour of faith and a shield of good purpose; a riddance of all vices; a rooting out of all evil desires and longings; an increase of love and patience, of humility and obedience, and of all virtues; a firm defence against the wiles of our enemies visible and invisible; a perfect quieting of all our sinful impulses fleshly and spiritual; a firm adherence to Thee, the one true God; and a happy consummation of our end. And we pray Thee that Thou wouldst vouchsafe to bring us sinners to that ineffable feast where Thou with Thy Son and the Holy Ghost art to Thy saints true light, full satisfaction, everlasting joy, complete delight, and perfect happiness; through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

We beseech Thee, O Lord Jesus Christ, that Thy passion may be unto us virtue, whereby we may be fenced, protected, and defended; let the sprinkling of Thy blood be unto us the washing away of all our sins; let Thy death be unto us eternal glory, both now and forever. Amen.

The grace of our Lord, etc.

CHAPTER IX

THE MYSTICAL MEANING OF THE LITURGY

THE Liturgy is the old name for our Eucharistic service. It was originally applied to it alone. Morning and Evening Prayer are known by the name of the Divine Office. The Liturgy and the Divine Office are the combination of the synagogue and the temple service. The Anglican communion has preserved the two in better proportions than any other religious body. She has marked their distinction by a careful architectural division of her chancels into choir and sanctuary. In Roman churches this distinction is not made. There, indeed, we find an altar and an altar service, but, save the unvarying meagre Sunday vespers, no public recitation of the Divine Office. In sectarian bodies we have a synagogue service, but no altar.

Thus Rome and the sects present a mutilated form of Christian worship. Both the synagogue and the temple worship are of divine origin or sanction, and in the new dispensation they passed on, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, into their glorified Christian condition.

It may, then, further aid in a devout celebration for the priest to have in mind the order and structure of his own Liturgy. It has grown into its present shape, we believe, under the superintendence of the Holy Spirit, and has consequently a meaning of its own. It is unlike that of Rome in

some of its features, and where we differ we have no wish to copy her. Also, our church services are unlike those of the dissenters, which are but a collection of hymns, prayers, Scripture readings, arranged apparently after no principle save that of variety and supposed effectiveness. But the Church's offices and her Liturgy have a unity like that of a symphony or a drama. There is an underlying movement and purposeful progression, like the unity of nature as she utters her psalm of life in the music of sounding sea, and wind-stirred trees, and chorus of singing-birds, and harmony of clouds, and shining beauty of starlit heavens, and the incense and perfume of herbs and flowers.

Throughout the sacred Liturgy of the Church there is in all its parts the undertone of the Spirit's voice. The service moves on in majestic order, like a wonderful drama. By it the work of redemption is "evidently," i.e., as "by a picture conspicuously and publicly exhibited," set forth before us. For as the Bible is the Word written, so the Gospel sacraments are the Word in action. They are the two living witnesses, filled with divine power, that shall prophesy unto the end. The Holy Communion is at once a solemn commemoration of the life and death of Christ, a presentation and pleading of Calvary's all-sufficient sacrifice, and a saving incorporation into it through our partaking of Christ's body and blood. It is a divine mystery. Human reason cannot fathom it. The whole transaction, and all its details, takes place within the

spiritual organism of which Christ is the ever-present centre, and is governed by its laws. How can we realize this? When the priest approaches the altar let him, by an act of faith, draw aside the veil between the heavenly and the earthly, and mentally prostrate himself, along with all the elders, before the throne as he enters into the glorious worship of the Lamb. Hushed be the tumult without and within as he enters into the divine presence.

It will help him in the maintenance of this devotional spirit if he can keep in mind the inspired order of the Liturgy. A first attempt to do this while celebrating is apt to be confusing. But when one has become so familiar with the service that he can say the unvarying parts by heart, he can without much difficulty keep before his mental vision the progressive movement of this acted mystery of redemption.

We may for this purpose divide the Liturgy into four parts or acts, the first consisting of the Lord's Prayer, the Collect for Purity, the recitation of the Decalogue or Summary, and the Kyries. This first part brings us into the presence of Almighty God. The recitation of the Decalogue in this place is a peculiarity of the Anglican rite. Let us not therefore disparage it, but rather glorify it; for may we not humbly believe that in the development of the Liturgy each portion of Christendom bears its own witness to the faith and has its own special liturgical glories? Our Liturgy, beginning with the Decalogue

and omitting the *Gloria in Excelsis*, is in striking contrast with the Roman. We can admit that the Roman order is more in accord with the primitive liturgies, and that there is something very beautiful in beginning the drama of Christ's life and death with the angels' song at Bethlehem. But yet it is a grand idea — a grander one, we venture to think — to throw the mind first of all back behind the scene of Bethlehem into the eternal counsels themselves and into the presence of the ever-blessed Trinity. The recitation of the Decalogue does this. It places us before the awful grandeur of God Himself, and enshrines us in the splendour of His glory. For the recitation of the Decalogue is not a promulgation of an arbitrarily imposed code of laws to regulate human conduct, but is a revelation of the divine nature by laws which could not have been otherwise than they are, any more than the rays of the sun could differ from its source. The Decalogue reveals the unique and perfect being of the Almighty; the sanctity of His Name; the marvellous combination of the dual principle of unceasing activity and absolute rest in His nature; the order and subordination found in the divine life itself, the basis of that order which holds family and state together. It brings us before God Himself, the eternal source of life Who makes all human life and its propagation sacred, the absolute justice and essential truth, the one and only all-satisfying end of us otherwise covetous mortals. In the presence of that absolute perfection we shrivel into nothing-

ness, and deplore our own sinful condition, and make our ever-needful plea for mercy. Surely there is something very deep and solemnizing in thus bringing the soul before the piercing splendour of the attributes of God.

The second part of the Liturgy extends from the collect for the day to the prayer for Christ's Church militant. It declares that God has heard the cry of humanity and bowed the heavens and come down. He has broken the eternal silence. God has become incarnate. He has to His own nature joined ours, and speaks to us through it as His organ of utterance. The eternal light and wisdom shine out through the human nature like light through an alabaster vase. The prevailing idea of this part of the Liturgy is Christ as the Prophet or Light of the World. Here we have the Epistle, the Word proclaimed by prophets and apostles going before or after Him; then the Gospel, the Word uttered by Himself in sermon, parable, miracle; then the Word preached or extended to us by His messengers and watchmen; then the Word confessed and proclaimed by all the Church in the Creed, swelling by each utterance the testimony of the ages to the faith, and saying: "This is the way, walk ye in it."

The third division of the Liturgy begins with the prayer for Christ's Church militant, and extends to the end of the canon. Here Christ as the Priest and Victim is brought before us. What does it do but remind us of that great liturgical prayer which

Christ made in the upper chamber when He summed up His lifework and pleaded for the unity of the Church and for the perfection of its members? Then follow the confession, absolution, comfortable words. Here we follow our Lord out from the upper chamber into Gethsemane's sorrow and agony. He has wrapped about Him our sins as a garment from off an outcast leper. As the representative of the race, He has taken those sins upon Himself. On our behalf alone, as bearing all the burden, He kneels and confesses them with tears of blood. The priest at the altar, as Christ's representative, likewise kneels, and, even if there should be no one to communicate with Him, says the great confession. It is an ever-abiding witness of Gethsemane's dark sorrow; it is part of the tragic drama of redemption. Then, as there appeared the angel strengthening Him, there come the absolution and the comfortable words. The light breaks in from heaven. Throughout Christ's life the angels ever attended Him. They sang the introit to His great lifelong sacrifice from off the rood-screen of the skies at Bethlehem. They are with Him at His Credo in the temptation. They wait beside Him at His act of penitence in the garden. They abide in silent adoration about His cross. They minister at His resurrection and ascension. He came to gather in one all things which are in heaven and earth. So in the very central portion of the Liturgy, amid the agony and betrayal and outward wrong and inward woe, the *Sursum Corda* opens the vision

of heaven, and we are one in our worship with the angels and saints.

But the drama hastens with a divine impulse of love to its consummation. Christ, delivered into the hands of wicked men, goes forth bearing His cross, and as He goes He falls beneath its weight. In two places, and two places only, in the Anglican rite is the celebrant bidden to kneel — once as he says the confession, in union with Christ in the garden, and again at the prayer of humble access, in union with Christ as He goes to Calvary.

Then, in the reverent hush that tells that God is near, the Liturgy proceeds with the canon. First comes the consecration. In the American rite there follows the oblation of the holy gifts, called gifts after the union by the consecration of the inward and outward parts of the sacrament, called creatures only before. Then the sacred memorial is offered to God, the Holy Spirit is invoked, and intercession is made for the whole Church. The communion comes next. The offering on Calvary's cross was for all mankind. We appropriate its work by faith, and by our communion and reception of Christ's body and blood are incorporated into it.

And when the dear and precious memorial before God has been presented and pleaded, and the communions made, the priest is bidden reverently to place upon the Lord's table what remaineth of the consecrated elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth. It was to protect the sacred elements that the Reformers added this rubric, so distinctive

a feature of our rite. Surely we may plead for its literal observance, which the use of a small cardboard, according to the Roman rite, does not fulfil. The symbolical reason for the use of this special veiling makes the act of loyalty the more dear. Does it not bring to mind the descent from the cross and the tender entombment of the body by loving hands, which wrapped it in linen and bore it to its burial?

Then follows the fourth and last great division. It is full of the spirit of the risen and ascended Christ. As the first two portions of the Liturgy set forth His prophetical and priestly work, here He is brought before us as our risen and ascended King. The Roman mass practically ends with the priest's communion, and then he consumes the elements. Is it not something worse than disloyalty for an Anglican priest to imitate this in the face of our rubric, which enforces the reservation of the sacrament until after the benediction? If it was for communion only that the sacrament was instituted, we might conceive that as soon as the communions were made the sacrament should be consumed. But the Prayer-Book orders its reservation and that the Benediction shall be given in its presence. Like the apostles, we assemble about our risen Lord, and are with Him, like them, in the sacred enclosure of the closed doors. He is in the midst of us, and we have received Him, and He is in us and we in Him. We rejoice in Him and adore Him as our King. We are incorporated into

His mystical body, and are ready to do all such good works as He has prepared for us to walk in. We gather about Him as when the disciples took their last walk with Him in the glorious sunlight of His resurrection, and He led them out as far as Bethany. Not unfittingly our Liturgy reserves the *Gloria in Excelsis* for this place. It is the triumphantly filled-out response made by the Church to the angels' song at Bethlehem. We have been raised up and made to sit in heavenly places. We gaze not up into a material heaven, but into the heaven whereof we form a part and wherein we are one with the apostles, as when they gathered beneath the benediction of the uplifted hands, and worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.

And then, after the blessing, the priest immediately and reverently consumes the sacred gifts, and we can but think of the saying: "He was taken up; and a cloud received Him out of their sight."

Neither disparaging other liturgies nor seeking to imitate them, we may be humbly thankful for that which, through all the trials and purifications of our own communion, God has preserved to us, and try more fully to enter into its spirit and be reverent in its celebration.

FOND DU LAC TRACTS

I

THE CHURCH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

A GOOD many earnest Christians are asking themselves the question: What is the Church? They know they must have some better reason for belonging to a religious body than that they were brought up in it. They keenly feel the inexpediency of trying to sustain in small towns so many places of worship, and the expensive burden it imposes upon the people. They try to meet the burden, perhaps, by the union meeting-house plan, but it has not been very successful. Some may possibly feel the hindrances caused to Christ's work by these sad divisions. Touched by the Holy Spirit they ask, on their bended knees, and with their Bibles in their hands: What does God's Word say about this matter? They humbly ask for light to know God's will, and grace and courage to embrace it. Make one such utterance to Him, dear reader, that you may be so guided; for "This," says Canon Hammond, "is a pivot question, and lies at the root of nearly all our schisms and differ-

ences. Amongst all the questions of the hour it stands first in importance."

What is the Church?

The Church is a Kingdom.

I. The Scripture record about it is this: The Gospel was given to man by Christ in the form of an Institution. The Gospel Christ preached was not an abstract Gospel. It was not a revelation of truth only. It was not a rule of life. It was not the giving to us of a great example. It was not a redemption effected by Calvary's sacrifice, and a mere proclamation of pardon to penitent believers, but it was "the Gospel of the Kingdom." How constantly this is recorded: "Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom."[1] This is the pure Gospel, the Gospel that Christ preached. Christianity came into the world (this is the first great truth), not as a doctrine, an idea, but as an institution. It was a Kingdom.

A Visible Society spiritually endowed.

II. Christ's Kingdom, we next observe, was not a kingdom of this world.[2] It was not like an earthly kingdom founded by a son of earth, because Christ was not of this world.[3] Nevertheless it was a kingdom. And like other of God's works, it was double. It had an outward and visible form, and an inward and invisible spirit. It had the outward form of a visible society, and an inward life. Its

[1] S. Matt. iv. 23. See also S. Matt. ix. 35; xxiv. 14.
[2] S. John xviii. 36. [3] S. John iii. 13.

outward form would be the product of human action and Divine power. It would be both like a "net" [1] constructed by human skill, and it would be like a "tree," [2] the product of Divine power. It would also have an inward invisible spirit. It would be a new life-power sown within a man, like a "seed," [3] or like "leaven" [4] hidden in the measures of meal. "The Kingdom of God is within you," [5] or "among you." Though visible and having outward form, it would be hidden in the world like a treasure that must be sought for; [6] and as an invisible spiritual power to be gained by man, it was like a pearl of great price, more valuable than all man's other possessions.[7]

III. This visible Society or Kingdom, possessed of a spiritual power, Christ called His Church. "I will build," He said, "My church." [8] We read, "Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it." [9] It was to be a "City set on an hill." [10] A "Temple" [11] of "lively stones." [12] "The Family" [13] of Jesus Christ. "The household of God." [14] It was to be a City set on a hill, not only visible, like a modern city, but like one of the ancient cities, set on high; a city surrounded by walls, a protected dwelling-place for human habitation, entrance into which was only through a guarded gateway. It

It was so formed by Christ.

[1] S. Matt. xiii. 47.
[2] S. Matt. xiii. 32.
[3] S. Mark iv. 26.
[4] S. Luke xiii. 21.
[5] S. Luke xvii. 21.
[6] S. Matt. xiii. 44.
[7] S. Matt. xiii. 46.
[8] S. Matt. xvi. 18.
[9] Eph. v. 25.
[10] S. Matt. v. 14.
[11] Eph. ii. 21.
[12] I Peter ii. 5.
[13] Eph. iii. 15.
[14] Eph. ii. 19.

was to be a Temple, one in design, purpose, structure; a unit in itself, yet composed of thousands of living souls, like stones builded together into one Temple. It was to be the Family of Jesus Christ, organically one,[1] because sharers in His Nature,[2] like brothers and sisters of a human family who are one as descendants of a common parentage. It was to be the household of God; for over those thus gathered into God in Christ, God would be the abiding Householder and Head. It was to be like a city, a temple, a family, a visible society filled with Divine life.[3]

IV. To this truth of the double aspect of the Church, the Holy Ghost speaking by the mouth of S. Paul bears witness. The Church is called by him "The Body of Christ."[4] Now a human body is something visible, material, substantial. The term "body," applied to the Church,[5] signifies, therefore, that the Church is an organized, visible community. The word "body" which S. Paul so applied "had come into recent use to describe the guilds of workmen, the trade unions of the Roman Empire."[6] They were visible and organized societies. From this word "corpus," or body, our word corporation comes. But then the Church is something more than a legal corporation. It is endowed with a spiritual life. It may therefore be called a Spiritual

It was so declared by the Holy Ghost.

[1] Gal. iii. 28; Eph. iv. 5.
[2] II Peter i. 4.
[3] Eph. i. 23.
[4] I Cor. xii. 27.
[5] Col. i. 24.
[6] Canon Hammond.

Body. This does not mean a body which would be like pure spirit, for this would be nonsense, and no body at all. The term, "Spiritual Body," signifies a real, visible, tangible body like our Lord's Risen Body, which is called a Spiritual Body. A Spiritual Body means a real, true body,[1] but one controlled by the Spirit. And this Body, Holy Scripture calls the "Church of God," [2] the "Church of the Living God." [3]

V. The Church, then, though possessed of a latent spiritual power, is a visible society founded by Jesus Christ. Any society which cannot trace its origin to Him as its Founder cannot be His Church, or part of His Church. Bodies which have a man for their founder, like Calvin,[4] or Luther,[5] or Wesley,[6] or Roger Williams,[7] are not the Church of Christ, nor are their organizations parts of the Church of Christ. Moreover, Christ founded *one* Church. He did not found many churches. He founded only one. This is a fact patent on the face of Holy Scripture. As there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, so there is but one Church.[8] The Bride is one.[9] Within the Church Christians may associate themselves

Of this Church Christ is the Founder.

And there is but one Church.

[1] *Vide* S. Luke xxiv. 39.
[2] Acts xx. 28.
[3] I Tim. iii. 15.
[4] The founder of a system called Calvinism. A.D. 1509–1564.
[5] The founder of Lutheranism. A.D. 1529.
[6] The founder of the Methodists. A.D. 1748.
[7] The founder of the Baptists. A.D. 1639.
[8] Eph. iv. 5.
[9] Rev. xxi. 2; see also II Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 32.

together for pious and religious purposes, and Christ will be in the midst of them,[1] but the association will not be a Church. The association together of a number of Christians does not make a Church; it only makes a congregation. There are within the one organization of the Christian Church, local ones, which are in Holy Scripture called the Church in such a place: the Church of the Thessalonians,[2] the Church at Philippi.[3] But to be part of the one organization Christ founded, the local one must be a subordinate organization within the Church, and not be as the sects are, independent organizations separate and apart from it. The denominations, being of late origin, and having men, however learned and eminent, for their founders, are societies separated from the original organization founded by Christ. Their members, as baptized believers, are Christians, but their organizations are mere congregations, human and man-made societies, and not the Church or part of the Church, which is the visible Body founded by Christ and endowed with invisible and spiritual life.

In this Church Christ abides.

VI. Now let us consider a further truth. The Church, then, we have seen, is a society which has for its Founder[4] and Head[5] the God-Man, Jesus Christ. But unlike all human founders of religions who have died and passed away, Jesus Christ has risen from the dead and ascended, and dwells in the midst of

[1] S. Matt. xviii. 19, 20.
[2] I Thess. i. 1.
[3] Phil. i. 1.
[4] I Cor. iii. 11.
[5] Col. i. 18.

His Church. When He ascended He did not go away to a distant star. He transported His Humanity into the Divine Glory, and a cloud hid Him from sight. But He remained, though invisible, surrounded by His Apostles and disciples.[1] He was in the midst of them — the centre of the new organization, or Church He had begun — the source of life to the new creation He was forming. He dwells in the midst of this new creation, which is His Church, just as Almighty God is present in the natural creation. Just as God sustains every created thing in the material universe by His power, so does the God-Man sustain all the members of the new creation by His Life. Out from His humanity life and grace flow to its members through the Sacraments and means of grace, which He personally, or through His Apostles, ordained. No Christian can therefore rightly, or for his soul's good, neglect Confirmation or the Eucharist or any other means of grace. If he does, he does two bad things — he wrongs Christ and injures himself. Christ did not leave any means of grace His followers do not need.

He is the source of truth and grace.

VII. The Church which Christ founded, He, as its High Priest, Prophet, and King, directs and administers. He did this primarily by His Apostles, whom He made sharers in His prophetical,[2] priestly,[3] and ruling powers,[4] and subsequently by others whom the

He acts through His Ministers.

[1] S. Matt. xxviii. 18.
[2] S. Matt. x. 7.
[3] S. Luke xxii. 19.
[4] S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

Apostles gathered by prayer and laying on of hands into fellowship with themselves.[1] In this way they were made partakers in different degrees in the Apostles' prerogatives and office, and became ministers of Christ. Unless persons have been so gathered into the Apostolic fellowship by the Apostles or the Bishops who now represent them they are not rightly ordained.[2] They have no share in the Apostolic commission, they are not authorized ministers of Christ, through whom, as His agents or representatives, He has pledged Himself to act.[3] They may be good persons, but they are not His legal ambassadors. Here we note a difference between the Law and the Gospel. Under the Law, the Prophets,[4] the Priests,[5] and the Kings,[6] were representatives of Jehovah, the Invisible God. But the Christian ministry does not represent the Invisible God. The Christian minister is not an ambassador from the Court of Heaven. He is an ambassador of the Incarnate God of God, made visible, of the Man Christ Jesus. He must therefore receive his commission either directly from Him, as the Apostles did[7] and as S. Paul[8] did to whom He appeared, or through the Apostles[9] whom alone He authorized to act in His name, and with whom He promised to be to the world's end.[10]

Appointed by Himself.

Or those He commissioned to appoint.

[1] II Tim. i. 6.
[2] Acts i. 26.
[3] Gal. i. 7, 8, 19.
[4] Heb. i. 1.
[5] Heb. v. 4.
[6] I Sam. xvi. 13.
[7] S. John xx. 22.
[8] Gal. i. 1, 12.
[9] Acts vi. 6.
[10] S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

VIII. The Church is a visible Society like a city set on a hill, and the gate through which we enter into it is Baptism.[1] It is a temple of living stones, and we are by Baptism made a part of it. It is the family of Jesus Christ, and we are made His when we are taken into it by Baptism. We are made His members, by being gathered into union with Him, Who, unseen, is yet in the midst of His Church. By Baptism the passive infant and the believing and penitent adult (who thereby puts himself in the same receptive condition as the little child) receive a seminal or seed principle of new life.[2] This gift is bestowed by the action of the Holy Spirit.[3] Our humanity is quickened by contact with the Humanity of Christ. We are made members of Him,[4] and so become united to one another[5] — this makes all the baptized, brothers and sisters. Is not this that "generation"[6] which shall not pass away until all be fulfilled; for it is written, His "seed"[7] shall be counted as a generation? Persons not baptized, however they may profess to take Christ for their example, are not yet Christians. To be a Christian you must do something more than trust in Him, or follow Him, or take Him for your example.[8] You must be a member of Jesus Christ; and Baptism is the only way of

By Baptism Christ makes us members of His Church.

[1] S. John iii. 3–5.
[2] I S. Peter i. 23.
[3] Acts xix. 3–5; Titus iii. 5.
[4] I Cor. vi. 15.
[5] I Cor. xii. 12, 27; S. Matt. xxiii. 8.
[6] S. Luke xxi. 32.
[7] Psalm xxii. 30.
[8] Gal. iii. 27; S. John xiv. 15.

becoming a member of Him. To be a member means you must be a part of Him, as really as the hand is part of the body.

IX. Now let us consider the difference between Baptism and Conversion. The Church requires both. The Church is known in Holy Scripture as a society of the "elect,"[1] or those "called."[2] The Greek word for Church (ecclesia) means *the called*. We are called by Holy Baptism. By it also the seed of the Christ-life is implanted within us, but without our co-operation it lies dormant. It becomes active at our conversion. Then the soul becomes conscious of its regenerate condition. For in the spiritual, as in the natural order, life precedes consciousness. The gift comes before the knowledge of it. So the regenerating gift in Holy Baptism is one thing, and conversion is another. Both are equally necessary. Our Lord says: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."[3] And with equal emphasis He declares, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."[4] Consequently, if baptized in infancy, you must be converted subsequently.[5] If, as an adult you have been converted, you must subsequently be baptized.[6] But conversion may be a

The Baptismal gift must be corresponded with.

[1] Col. iii. 12; I Pet. v. 13.
[2] I Cor. i. 26; II Tim. i. 9.
[3] S. John iii. 5.
[4] S. Matt. xviii. 3.
[5] Acts viii. 13. Simon Magus, an example of adult Baptism *before* Conversion.
[6] Acts ix. 17, 18. S. Paul, an example of Baptism *after* Conversion.

longer or a shorter process — gradual or instantaneous — calm or convulsed. If baptized in infancy, by your conversion you will come to realize your regenerate condition. If, as an adult you have been converted before Baptism, you will by your conversion realize indeed Christ's marvellous mercy in accepting you; but when baptized you will realize that you are by a new Divine gift united to Him also. Note, you were God's child by your birth and creation.[1] "We are His offspring." Though deserving of punishment as "children of wrath," we are nevertheless by the act of creation His children. Baptism does not proclaim that fact. It is not like the coronation of a king, who is a king by descent and before he is crowned. By creation we are all God's children,[2] but by Baptism we become God's children [3] by adoption and grace. We become by Baptism members of the God-Man, Jesus Christ, who is the Second Adam and the Head of the new Creation.

X. It is often objected that Christians are inconsistent. Their faults are fruitful topics for unbelievers. Persons say that they do not see that Baptism does any good. Truly the "seed" sown in Baptism will perish if it is not properly cared for. So the next truth we want to keep in mind is, that the Church into which by Baptism we are called, is an educational society. It is a society wherein

The Church is therefore an educational society.

[1] Mal. ii. 10.
[2] Acts xvii. 28.
[3] Gal. iii. 27; *vide* Isa. ix. 6, 7.

by Baptism the imperfect, though converted, are gathered for their spiritual training and development. But it is a school wherein many by neglect of the means of grace fail of attaining their end. Thus we learn this other truth about the Church. The Church has within her the tares and the wheat,[1] the wise and the foolish virgins,[2] the bad and the good fish.[3] It is no reproach to her that this is so, for her mission is an educational one. She has her glorious martyrs, confessors, saints, her Religious Orders and her class of perfection. But still many walk carelessly. Some are like the Pharisees.[4] Some are worldly Herodians.[5] Many are called by Baptism, but few chosen.[6] Only those who persevere unto the end will be saved.[7] Are you, dear reader, if a Churchman, earnestly striving after a closer walk with God? Do you mortify your body,[8] discipline your soul,[9] give freely of your substance,[10] examine your conscience daily,[11] love your enemies?[12] Are you striving after perfection and using all the means of grace the Church offers you? Are the interests of Jesus and His Church your dominant ones, and do you love Him with all your heart? If you are a Christian, let reform begin with yourself.[13] When Gideon set out to deliver Israel from idolatry, first of all went down the idols in his father's house.[14]

With bad and good in it.

[1] S. Matt. xiii. 24, 25.
[2] S. Matt. xxv. 1.
[3] S. Matt. xiii. 47.
[4] S. Matt. xxii. 15.
[5] S. Matt. xxii. 16.
[6] S. Matt. xx. 16.
[7] S. Matt. x. 22.
[8] I Cor. ix. 27.
[9] S. Luke xxi. 19.
[10] Acts xx. 35.
[11] II Cor. xiii. 5.
[12] S. Matt. v. 44.
[13] S. Luke xv. 18.
[14] Judges vi. 25–27.

If you are not a Churchman, judge not of the Church by the lives of the careless and indifferent, but by the lives of the best. That consideration converted a great French infidel, and may convert you.

XI. The Church is thus a visible society, an educational society, and it is something more, it is a Divine organization; we say this, for it has Christ the God-Man for its founder. And it is something more than an organization even; it is an organism. You know the difference. An organization man may make. An organism is something only God can make. There is all the difference between the two, as between a steam engine and a tree. An organism is something which has life in itself. The Holy Ghost, the Life Giver, dwells in the Church.[1] He came down at Pentecost,[2] and has dwelt in her ever since. This makes the Church a living organism. It is a spiritual organism having a reproductive power. It is the effectual instrumentality for the salvation and perfection of man. It is the organism through which Christ's Life and Light come to us. We are saved by the Church, or, rather, Christ saves us through the Church.[3] Thus we must be in it, a living stone of a living temple.

The Church is a spiritual organism.

We all need not only to be once converted but to be twice converted. We must be converted to Christ. He is the foundation. We must turn away from the world, and turn with all our heart to Him.[4] We

And we need two conversions.

[1] S. John xiv. 16. [2] Acts ii. 1, 4. [3] Acts ii. 47. [4] S. Mark x. 21.

must surrender ourselves entirely to Him.[1] Surrender our mind to His mind, to believe what He says because He says it,[2] our heart to Him, to hate all that He hates and love all He loves,[3] our will to Him, that He may have His way and Will with us in all things.[4] In this way will He be to us our Saviour, from the world, and self, and sin.

But, if we would fully know His will and have the grace to fulfil it, we must be also converted to the Church, to the Church He founded, the one organization founded at Pentecost. The Church He bought with His own precious Blood is the Church He loved, the Church which is the organ of His Life and Light. The Church must come to be our Spiritual Mother as Christ is our Saviour. We need both conversions. They must both be the work of the Holy Spirit. The man who has only experienced one of them is only a half converted man.

Dear reader, which are you?

XII. Let us now see when and how the Christian Church came into existence. The Church, or Spiritual Organism in which by Baptism we are new born to God, and which should be our Spiritual Mother, Christ began to form during His visible ministry. The Gospels only tell us of the beginnings of Christ's work in the formation of His Church.[5] Many persons think they can find the whole of Christ's reve-

The Church came into being at Pentecost.

[1] Acts ix. 6.
[2] II Cor. x. 5.
[3] S. Matt. xi. 29; Ps. lxxxvi. 11.
[4] S. Matt. xxvi. 39.
[5] Acts i. 1.

lation in the Gospels. But this is not so. They only tell how Christ began to get disciples round about Him, and began to form His Church. He had to lead them on little by little. There was a great deal He did not tell even the Apostles during His public ministry. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." [1] Neither could they understand His words and actions fully, till after they received the Holy Ghost.[2] Everything was inchoate and incomplete during Christ's ministry. The Church was in process of construction.

The Church was not completed and made a living, spiritual organism till the day of Pentecost.[3] Pentecost is the birthday of the Christian Church. It can no more be repeated than the birthday of Christ can be repeated. On the day of Pentecost the Holy Ghost came down, and came down once for all to dwell in the Church. Then the Church, which is Christ's Mystical Body, was born. It was complete in its structure, with Christ for its Head, and the Holy Ghost for its Heart, and the Apostolic priesthood for its organs of utterance and action. It was complete in its structure, and endowed with life, as an infant is complete in body and soul though it is to grow in strength and size.

XIII. The Church has four distinctive marks upon it. It is One,[4] Holy,[5] Catholic,[6] and Apos-

[1] S. John xvi. 12.
[2] S. Luke xviii. 34; S. John xiv. 26.
[3] Acts i. 4; ii. 4.
[4] S. John xvii. 21; Eph. iv. 3–13.
[5] S. John xvii. 17; Rom. xi. 16.
[6] S. Matt. xxviii. 19; I Tim. ii. 4.

tolic.[1] If these marks are not to be found on any religious society calling itself Christian, it is a further proof that it is not a portion of the Church of Jesus Christ.

The four marks of the Church.

Consider now these four marks. These are some of the things they signify: the Church of Christ is a Society that must be Apostolic in its government, Catholic in its doctrine, Holy in its transforming power, and One.

She must be Apostolic. Her ministry must be gathered, by prayer and laying on of hands, into union with the Apostles and their successors the Bishops, and commissioned by them. They are thus made Christ's Ambassadors, and their official acts bind Him,[2] for He acts through them. They are Christ's stewards[3] and He distributes His Sacramental gifts by them.

Apostolic.

The Church must be Catholic, or Universal, because she endures throughout all ages,[4] teaches all nations,[5] and her doctrines (all such as she declares essential) must bear the test of Catholicity. They must be doctrines put forth or believed in as essential by the whole and undivided Church, not by any one part, Latin, or Eastern, or Anglican. They must bear the threefold test of Catholicity, being held from the beginning,[6] and by all the Church throughout the world,[7] and must be corroborated by Holy Scripture.[8]

Catholic.

[1] Acts ii. 42.
[2] S. Matt. xviii. 18.
[3] I Cor. iv. 1.
[4] S. Matt. xvi. 18.
[5] S. Matt. xxviii. 19.
[6] Jude 3.
[7] I Cor. iv. 17.
[8] S. John v. 39; I Thes. v. 21.

The Church must be Holy.[1] She is Holy, for the Holy Ghost came down to dwell within her at Pentecost, and abides in her to this day. Holy, because the opportunity of holiness for all her members is secured within her by the preservation of the means of grace: of Orders,[2] Confirmation,[3] Baptism,[4] Absolution,[5] the Holy Eucharist,[6] Holy Matrimony,[7] Visitation of the Sick.[8] Her holiness is borne witness to by her Religious Orders, her Martyrs, Bishops and Missionaries, and she is the Mother of Saints.

Holy.

She is One, as having One Head, Jesus Christ. Her Oneness is secured by the Sacramental union of all her members in Him, her living and ever present Head.[9] For this unity Christ prayed when He prayed that His members might be one, as He and the Father were One.[10] This prayer has been answered, for being made members of Christ, we are one by the participation in a nature common to us all. This is that indestructible unity which the gates of hell cannot prevail against.[11]

One.

Union is, however, something different from unity, and union may be violated without unity being broken. A family may be a disunited family and yet is but one family. The Church ought to be outwardly united. Her outward union among her

[1] Eph. v. 27.
[2] S. John xx. 22.
[3] Acts viii. 17.
[4] S. Matt. xxviii. 19.
[5] S. John xx. 23.
[6] I Cor. xi. 23–26.
[7] Eph. v. 31. 32.
[8] S. James v. 14.
[9] Eph. iv. 25; v. 23.
[10] S. John xvii. 21.
[11] S. Matt. xvi. 18.

members is provided for by the law which forbids the imposition of any uncatholic or unscriptural doctrine as a term of communion. Her discipline is preserved by subordination of her members in things spiritual to the Canons of the Church, and to the Bishop in each Diocese as Christ's representative.[1] The discipline of the Bishops is guarded by Canon Law and their subordination to the solidarity of the Episcopate, apart from which they cannot declare doctrines authoritatively, and in whose name they administer discipline.

XIV. The Anglican Church is an integral part of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

The Anglican Church has these four marks.

It is not like one of the Sects. It is not a society founded by man. It is connected with the Apostolic Order. The Church of Christ founded at Jerusalem, having there its three orders of ministry and Sacraments, extended itself in early times to the British Isles. Thus it is part of the organization Christ founded. It is a branch of the Vine of which Christ said: "I am the Vine, and ye," including Peter (as only one), "are the branches."[2] It is built on the Rock[3] which Holy Scripture declares is Christ,[4] and upon which Peter was to be laid as one of the twelve foundation stones.[5] The continuity of the Church's organization was never broken. At the time of the Reformation, it did not break away from the other Churches. Canon

[1] II Cor. v. 20. [3] S. Matt. xvi. 18.
[2] S. John xv. 5. [4] I Cor. x. 4. [5] Rev. xxi. 14; Eph. ii. 20.

XXX. declares: "So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany," it "only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders." It was because the Church of England would not have what was unscriptural and uncatholic, the Roman Church broke away from it.[1] As Mr. Gladstone says: "The Church of England is the same Church that existed from the beginning. There was no new Church created in the reign of Henry VIII." And now this Anglican Church possessed of an Apostolic ministry extends throughout the world.

It holds the ancient faith as contained in the ancient Creeds and as declared by the consent of Christendom, but does not force on the laity a human made scheme of doctrine. The Church teaches with authority but allows diversity of opinions in things unessential. It preserves all the means of grace, as the sects unfortunately do not. It is full of missionary zeal for Christ. It points to the highest sanctity, and develops saints. It is, however, a field where are the tares and wheat, where are the careless and zealous, the beginners and proficients, the spiritual and the worldly. Within the Church are schools of opinion, like the High and Low — which are complementary one to the other. They are like the two sides of a man's

[1] In 1570, 12th year of Elizabeth's reign.

face, and as needful for its perfection. They are like the waves which look divided, but are one as the sea. It is very easy to find points to criticise, but the sober wisdom of the Church, the dignity of her worship, and her real worth, Christians separated from her have often acknowledged.

The appeal of the Anglican Church.

Even if her claims are exaggerated, yet she is not a wicked Church, who would say that? She does not force any one to accept what the Bible does not warrant, or antiquity does not witness to. If so, may she not ask Non-Conformists in England and their spiritual descendants in this country, Was it right to leave her? Was it right for Christians to break away from their Mother, and set up societies of their own manufacture? This is what the Methodists,[1] Presbyterians,[2] Congregationalists,[3] Baptists,[4] and others have done. Is it wise in our day to keep up these divisions and this multiplicity of sect life?[5] Is it well for Christians thus to hinder the more effectual work of the Holy Spirit? It is this which grieves Christ and hinders His work, which makes infidels sneer, which places such a heavy burden on the laity to support the gospel. The continuance of divisions by sect building is not the way to union.

[1] Founded by John Wesley, 1748.

[2] Founded by John Knox, 1520–60.

[3] Founded by Robert Brown, 1583.

[4] Founded by Roger Williams, 1639.

[5] From statistics in *The World Almanac* (N. Y.) it may be seen that there are 138 sects, and sect divisions, among Protestant Christians in this country.

The way to union and to bring God's blessing is to unite and return to the Church He founded.

XV. Let us now consider some popular objections to the Church. It is sometimes said you are too much like the Roman Church. Now we differ from Rome in five particulars. In Church government, in our rule of faith, in doctrine, in Church discipline, and worship. In Church government we repudiate the claim of the Pope to supremacy,[1] and to be the sole source of jurisdiction, and that to be in communion with the Roman See is the test of orthodoxy. In respect of our rule of faith, we believe in the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church as the appointed guardian and teacher of the Faith once for all delivered,[2] verified as it is by Holy Scripture, safeguarded by the Creeds, witnessed by the Sacraments; but we deny that the Pope's dogmatic utterances apart from any Council and by virtue of his supposed infallibility are to be received and believed under peril of damnation. In regard to doctrine we accept all the doctrines, believe in all the means of grace, that the Church in her Œcumenical Councils has ever declared, and which are witnessed to by the common consent of Christendom. But we reject[3] those modern additions to the Faith, which were not put forth by Œcumenical authority and cannot be proved by the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers —viz., the infallibility of the Pope, or the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. And there are

Objections.

Too much like Rome.

[1] Gal. ii. 11. [2] Jude 3. [3] S. Matt. xviii. 17.

other popular Roman teachings we do not hold, such as the penal fires of purgatory and the system of indulgences. In the matter of Church discipline, we allow of the marriage of the clergy and do not make confession to a Priest obligatory before communion.. In our worship we continue the Apostolic order of having the service in a tongue understood by the people, and according to the command of the Lord and the practice of the undivided and ancient Church give the Blessed Sacrament in both kinds to the people. And in all these matters the Anglican Church is one with the Orthodox Russian and Eastern Churches in opposition to Rome.

You look like Rome.

XVI. But it is said, if you are thus radically different from Rome, why do your clergy wear cassocks and surplices and stoles and other vestments just as the Roman Priests do, and why do you often adorn your Altars with flowers and have on it a cross and sometimes lights? We have these things because they are Scriptural and ancient, are part of our Church heritage and show our continuity with the past. These things, differing of course somewhat with changing fashions, have always been in the Church of Christ since the time our Lord took S. John up into heaven and showed him the pattern of the Church's worship.[1]

But are you not going to Rome? Have not a number of persons joined that Church? Yes. There is always some drift-wood, going one way and

[1] Rev. i. 1.

another. But, as a matter of fact, no persons of any marked distinction and learning have gone from us to the Church of Rome for a great many years, while on the continent of Europe a large number of very learned priests have left Rome and taken up our position towards her, and in America more have come to us than have gone to them. Instead of our tendency being towards Rome it is just the reverse. We are, as the sects cannot be, a bulwark against Rome. We have the Catholic Faith without Rome's additions. We preserve to the Laity their rights as Rome does not. We are a harbour of refuge for a number of dissatisfied Romans, who desire to be Americans and Catholics, but are too intelligent to be longer Papists. Should our Church ever become what it ought to become in holiness and worship, it would attract a large number of Romans within its fold.

XVII. Another objection is this: Sectarians say, sometimes, that the Church is worldly — because it does not forbid its members to dance or play cards. Now the Church has her own discipline and standard of life set forth in the Prayer-Book, which involves far greater self-denial. But she does not forbid these particular things, because we are not now under the law, but under the Gospel.[1] And under the Gospel Christ gives us principles to act on, and leaves the individual to apply them, each for himself. The great principle is, that the evil world is to each man what-

Objection that she is worldly.

[1] Gal. v. 1; Rom. xiv.

ever he finds comes in between his soul and God, and separates them. But each man must apply that principle conscientiously for himself.

"But you Church people are so illiberal," the Sects say. "We are willing to recognize you as Christians, but you do not recognize us. We are willing to recognize your clergy, but you do not recognize ours." Now, dear friends, you make a huge mistake. We do recognize every baptized believer as a Christian, though we think he is depriving himself of many means of Grace — Confirmation [1] and others — by remaining where he is. And about your ministers, we do recognize them to be what they themselves claim to be. They claim to be Christian preachers — and so they are. But they do not claim to be part of the threefold Order of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which have existed from Apostolic times, or to have the powers of a Priest. Is it illiberal, then, to deny these ministers to be what they themselves repudiate?

Illiberal.

"But if you Church people acknowledge that we are Christians, why do you forbid us to receive Communion in your Churches?" We do not. We should be glad if you came always and received this Sacrament from us, and were prepared for it by previously receiving the Gift of the Holy Ghost in Confirmation. But we should do a harm to your souls if we allowed you to come, and did not let you know that there is

Close Communion.

[1] Acts viii. 17, xiv. 6.

a difference between your communion and ours. Yours is only a memorial service — this is what you claim it to be, and we admit that it is so. It is a memorial of a past event — the death of Christ. In ours, by the Priest's consecration of the elements, and the power of the Holy Spirit, Christ is really and truly present. We receive His Body and Blood.[1] To come and not discern that Body would do you a great harm.[2] It is out of love to you that we would have you prepare by receiving Confirmation. Is that illiberal? We have received great spiritual gifts from Christ, and we must guard them for His sake and yours. "Liberal" means "to make free with." A man may make free with what belongs to him. But the ministry and faith and the Sacraments do not belong to us. They belong to Christ, and we cannot make free with what is not our own.

Ritual and Ceremony.

But again — "I do not like your forms and ceremonies." Well, then, why are you perpetually copying them? Once you said that it was wrong to have handsome churches, stained glass windows; that organs were a contrivance of Satan; chanting was rank popery; forms of worship of every kind were a quenching of the Spirit. Now you have them all in abundance. You see that your old Mother Church has been right all along. Maybe she is right in other matters which you now object to. You once thought it wrong to have a form of prayer — as not praying with the Spirit. Then some wise teacher among

[1] S. Matt. xxvi. 26–29. [2] I Cor. xi. 27.

you noticed that S. Paul said we must "sing," as well as pray, with the understanding and spirit.[1] Well, how could we sing without a hymn book or form, so that all could unite in the singing? And how could there be united prayer unless there was a form of prayer, so all could unite in the praying? For either those who listen to an extemporaneous prayer of their minister just listen to him and so do not pray at all, or they adopt his words and so use a given form of prayer. If, dear friend, you are thus getting over some of your prejudices, why not get over all of them?

XVIII. Schism is a sin.[2] It is only another form of lawlessness. It is only another manifestation of disobedience and self-will. It is man's saying "my way is better than Christ's way." "Where one Church has had exclusive sway," it is argued, "that Church has invariably become worldly and corrupt." Was the Church in the Apostles' days, when it was one, worldly and corrupt? "Competition," it is said, "is as necessary in Church work as in business." And so there must be rival sects, one saying "I am of Luther," and "I am of Wesley," and "I of Calvin," and "I of Campbell," and "I of Channing," and "I of Joe Smith." "Or," it is claimed, "the Church that does not reach out in the present day will not grow." Was not the united Church aggressive when the great missionaries in early times brought whole nations to Christ? Must we

The sin of schism.

[1] I Cor. xiv. 15.

[2] I Cor. xii. 25.

not, then, in the Master's interests, say again that schism is a sin? What the human heart rebels against is submission. But what brings joy and peace unspeakable is heart surrender to Christ as our Saviour, and to His Church as the organ in which He lives, and through which He acts.

XIX. But lastly it may be said by dissenters: "Why do not you Episcopalians, if you want union for Christ's sake, join Rome, or come to us?" One reason is, we did not go out from either of you; you in England went out from us, and we ask you to come home. And another reason is: We can give Romans all they have, and Sectarians something more than they have; but you cannot give us any divine and gospel gift that we do not now possess.

Why unite with the Church?

We make no hard terms of Communion. We say: Here is the ancient order of Church government, and the Sacraments, and the ancient Creeds. Accept them, and then you can hold your own private opinion in things unessential. Such opinions should not separate Christians, and make them break up into expensive and burdensome Sects. If a number of Methodist brethren come to the Church and want to keep up their class meetings — why not? They are at liberty to do so. A good Congregationalist believes in conversion. Thank God he does — so does the Church, and would have all her children know what vital piety is. A Baptist wants to be immersed. Why should that lead to a Sect and schism? The Church provides for that

mode of administering Baptism to any who so desire. A Presbyterian believes himself to be one of the predestinated — well, so long as it is a comfort to him and does not separate him from another, who, like S. Paul, fears that he may be a castaway,[1] let him hold his own opinion. High and Low Churchmen kneel at the same altar and emphasize different aspects of the same truth, but are brethren of one household. Why should these schismatic and expensive separate organizations continue, and so grieve Christ and hinder His work? What, reader, God asks you, are you going to do? What prejudice, and feeling, and old association will you not lay as an offering at His feet?

Conclusion.

XX. Place again before you the fact that Christ created a spiritual organism which is His Church. It is the New Creation.[2] It is being evolved out of the old order of nature. It is to endure for Eternity. It is the sphere of light and bliss and progressive union with the Divine Life. This organism, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, is in three different conditions. It is militant here on earth.[3] It is progressive in its condition of rest and purification.[4] It is reigning in heaven with Christ.[5] The spiritual organism has for its Head Christ, Who is not separate from her but dwells in His Church, and Who manifests Himself in glory to His Saints in Paradise, and to

[1] I Cor. ix. 27.
[2] II Cor. v. 17.
[3] I Tim. vi. 12.
[4] Philip. i. 6; I S. John iii. 2.
[5] Rev. xiv. 5.

us on earth under the sacramental veils which hide that glory in the Blessed Eucharist. Christ is thus the living and ever-present Head of His Church, which is His Mystical Body and which will be His future Bride.

Lift your heart above the strife of tongues, and let the vision of this wonderful organism become real to you, and live in it. It is not by living in the natural order your nature will attain its happiness. It is not simply by believing and trusting in Christ you attain perfection. It is by becoming a stone of the Living Temple, a member of the Church He founded. Christ and the Holy Spirit dwell within it. Enter it, if you do not now belong to it; if you do, be a more true, loving, devoted Churchman.

II

THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST

ONE great difference between Churchmen is that some believe in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, and others do not. The latter believe that the consecrated elements are mere symbols or pledges or signs of Christ's Body and Blood. Some of them hold that at the time of reception Christ feeds with His Body and Blood those who have faith, but they do not hold that the elements are anything more than sacred symbols or ordained signs. They would perhaps say that Christ is present "in the sacrament," i.e., in the use of the sacrament. The others believe that by the act of consecration the elements or outward signs, and the inward part of the sacrament, viz., the Body and Blood of Christ, are sacramentally united.

This Presence is called Real, because it is the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood. It is called an objective Presence, because it is not a mere

subjective Presence in the heart of the receiver, but, being occasioned by the act of consecration, is there before it is received. We will consider, in this tract, which is the truer view, according to the New Testament.

First, let us remove some popular misunderstandings or objections. Some have tried to puzzle simple Christians by asking: With which Body do you communicate, the Body on the cross, or the glorified Body of our Lord? The answer is, that Christ had only one Body, and that the Body which is now in a glorified condition is the same Body that hung on the cross. We are to be incorporated into that one Sacred Humanity, whose Blood was shed for our redemption, and which rose for our justification.

Others, when doubting, have puzzled themselves with questions concerning the character of the change wrought in the elements or the mode of union between the inward and the outward parts. We content ourselves with saying that the change is not after any natural law, or like any change that takes place in the material world. For the whole transaction takes place in the new kingdom or creation which has laws of its own. It takes place in that spiritual organism which is the Church, the mystical Body of Christ. Everything connected with that organism, priests, elements, people, are partakers of its spiritual character, and are governed by its spiritual laws.

"How," it is asked again, "if the doctrine of the

Real Presence be the true one, can Christ's Body be in Heaven and at the same time be on earth and on so many altars at the same time?" The answer is, our Lord does not need to move, to do this. He is the centre of the spiritual organism which is His Body, the Church. His own Body is not ubiquitous, but by reason of its union with His omnipresent Divine Nature, He can make It manifest in His Church where He will and at many altars at the same time. He gave us a proof of this after His ascension to the Right Hand of the Father, where He permanently abides by appearing and talking to S. Paul in the roadway.

It is sometimes asked by loyal Churchmen, Wherein does our doctrine differ from Transubstantiation? The answer is, that that word has meant different things at different times. The kind of Transubstantiation which is repudiated in our Articles, viz., the change of bread and wine into flesh and blood, happily was repudiated by the Council of Trent. The present doctrine of Rome was formulated after our Article was written. We hold the ancient faith of the Real Presence. The Anglican Church asserts it as a fact. The Roman tries to explain it. It puts the statement of it in the terms of the Aristotelian philosophy which makes a distinction between accidents and substance. Our Church does not teach the Roman view, but we do believe in a Real Objective Presence.

Another difficulty has presented itself to some minds rightly jealous of the one, full, perfect, and

sufficient sacrifice and oblation made on Calvary. They say that Christ made one offering on the cross, and this doctrine of the Real Presence involves that of altar and sacrifice. So it does. But it in nowise impairs or detracts from the one Sacrifice offered once for all. Christ on the cross offered a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice for all mankind. He offered it for humanity. He took away, by His act of reparation on behalf of humanity which He represented, the barrier which hindered the full, free action of God's Love to His creature man. He took upon Himself our sins. "He became sin," i.e., the sin victim, for us. He became our substitute. The chastisement of our peace was laid upon Him. He made an atonement for us. That atoning work is done. "It is finished." But does not every individual need to plead, in the way Christ has ordained, that sacrifice to make it avail for his own sins and his own personal acceptance? As at the end of every prayer, by saying "through Jesus Christ our Lord," we plead by word this sacrifice and its merits, so by the breaking of the Bread and the blessing of the Cup, we set it forth and plead it by the Act He has ordained.

Another difficulty sometimes presents itself to devout believers. They fear, and rightly, a mechanical religion. They fear what seems like a Judaizing spirit, a reliance on externals or forms of any kind. They know that a living faith is necessary to a saving union with Christ. They may have seen Church members who gave no sign

of an evangelical spirit, persons who were resting on the fact of their Baptism or Confirmation; nominal Christians, who had never seemingly corresponded to the convicting and converting power of the Holy Spirit; in whom the seed-principle implanted in Baptism had lain dormant and who had never been consciously born again; or if once with God, had ceased to walk with Him, and whose life was one of mere outward conformity to certain Church requirements. Need we say that we agree with the spirit of this objection? Sacraments are means by which God offers to us His gifts of grace. They will, however, do us no good, but increase our condemnation, unless we receive them with faith and love.

We have stated the above as preparatory to the consideration of the truth of Christ's Objective Presence in the Sacrament under the visible forms of Bread and Wine. If the faithful of the Anglican Church would only grasp and realize this, not as a speculative belief and giving it a mere intellectual assent, but as a heartfelt and practical conviction, the lives of her children would develop into most fruitful sanctity. Indeed, there would be kindled such a fire of enthusiastic love for Jesus as would energetically advance the Master's Kingdom. Jesus would be our all, and our all for Jesus.

We purpose to consider this great fact of Christ's Presence only in the light of Holy Scripture. Much that we may say will be taken from others. We do not claim to be original. We only ask our

readers sincerely to pray for Divine guidance and humbly submit themselves to the Holy Word of God. We pray Him to arouse the Episcopal Church as He did the luke-warm Israelites at the time of Ezra, and set its members on fire with Divine love and zeal for the advancement of His Kingdom.

CHAPTER II

THE EUCHARIST IN ST. JOHN

LET us now consider together, with the aid of the Holy Spirit,

What Holy Scripture says about the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

First we will examine the account as given in St. John's gospel.

St. John is the acknowledged evangelist of the Incarnation. He begins with "the Word was God" and "the Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us." He especially bears witness to the Incarnation and the extension of its grace through the Sacraments. The other Evangelists record the institution of the two great Sacraments. But St. John's gospel, being written after the "Revelation," and coming to the established Church, records for its benefit, not the institution of the Sacraments, for this had been done, but our Lord's discourses explaining them. Thus we find in this gospel our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus explaining Christian Baptism, and that on the Eucharist

after the feeding of the five thousand. This latter discourse is recorded in the sixth chapter.

Opponents to the belief in the Real Presence have held that this chapter does not refer to the Eucharist. Among these are Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, Bullinger, Barnes, and others of modern times. Their arguments are these: first, that at the time our Lord pronounced these words, the Holy Communion was not instituted, and so He could not be understood as referring to it. The same argument, however, would apply to our Lord's discourse on Baptism to Nicodemus, which most admit relates to that Sacrament. Also this objection would seemingly apply as well to our Lord's crucifixion, to which these opponents claim our Lord's words refer. It must be allowed that those who heard our Lord could not then understand the means by which Christ was to give them His Body to eat. It does not follow, however, that the discourse was not intended to teach the doctrine. The means were to be revealed afterwards by the Last Supper. Whether there is reference to the Sacrament in this discourse must be determined by internal evidence.

A second objection raised is, that no conditions concerning the reception are given, so that no matter with what dispositions one would eat the Flesh and drink the Blood, he would be saved. Hence it is argued there can be no reference here to the Eucharist, but to Christ's death, in which we must have evangelical faith in order to be benefited.

Undoubtedly it is true one must have an evangelical faith in Christ's death to be profited by it; but the text says nothing about a "true evangelical faith" as the condition of a saving appropriation of Christ's death, any more than it gives the proper disposition for a worthy reception. The fact being that the proper conditions for the reception of Christ's gifts are necessarily implied and are stated elsewhere in their proper place in God's Word. It is the same with Baptism as with the Eucharist.

A third argument is based on the different words used in the discourse and in the institution. Here, Christ says we must eat of His *Flesh* and drink His Blood. There, our Lord says, "This is My *Body*." He uses the word "Flesh" in the one case and "Body" in the other. The argument will no doubt seem weak and trivial to our readers; we state it because we wish them to know all that is said on that side. The answer indeed is a very simple and easy one. Our Lord in the upper chamber, referring to His death in which His Body, as one whole thing, was to be broken, says appropriately of the bread in His hand, "This is My Body." But in teaching the sacramental feeding, He as appropriately does not say "eat My Body," but My "Flesh." True in eating Christ's Flesh we receive Christ wholly. But Christ properly uses the word "Flesh" when referring to reception, and "Body" when referring to His death.

Fourthly it is said that the chapter could not refer to the Communion because its reception would

then be made an absolute condition for salvation for all men. No one could be saved, it is argued, save those who received it. The answer is that the same objection might be raised against Baptism. For it is written, "Whoso believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But Christ in regard to each Sacrament is speaking to His disciples; not to those under the law, or in heathen lands. And does not our Prayer-Book directly answer the objection when, referring to the necessity of Baptism, it says, "where it may be had"? So, too, it speaks of our reception of the Communion, when by reason of any just impediment one is unable to receive the consecrated elements, yet if he do truly repent and believe, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of His Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health.

There is another set of commentators, who, while holding that the chapter refers to the spiritual union with the Saviour by faith, as we also do, yet hold that indirectly it refers to the Sacrament. Among these are Doddridge, Alford, Bengal, Stier, Godet, Dr. Schaff. Dean Alford says: "The question whether there is any reference to the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper has been inaccurately put. When cleared of inaccuracy in terms it will mean, Is the subject here dwelt upon the same as that which is set forth in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper? And of this there can surely be no doubt." Another of these commentators thus states this position: "What our Lord said at this time He afterwards

expressed in a permanent form by the Sacrament of His Body and Blood."

It will be sufficiently convincing to Churchmen to know that for the most part the ancient fathers, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, and all that cohort of holy men, who to our Church are dear, refer this discourse to the Holy Eucharist. It is so referred to in the third General Council held at Ephesus, A.D. 431. In the Epistle of St. Cyril to Nestorius he quotes this chapter: "When the Son of God became united to His Flesh, He made it also to be Life-giving, as also He said to us: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man and drink His Blood.'" Our own Anglican Church likewise did this in her old form of exhortation to receive the Holy Communion, where she quoted this sixth chapter of St. John as applicable to it.

For us the question seems to be settled, by the prayer of Humble Access, in which the words of this chapter are quoted as referring to the Sacrament: "Grant us so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood." We here apply the most crucial words of our Lord in this chapter, the eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood, to the Communion. We quote also His very words, "dwelleth in Me and I in him," praying that "we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us."

Our great Anglican Divines, Hooker, Andrewes, Wordsworth, and many others, hold this view.

Keble, whose saintliness and balanced wisdom is recognized by all, said: "I assume that the sixth chapter of St. John really and primarily relates to the sacrament of Holy Communion; according to the well-known interpretation of Hooker, which is the interpretation of all antiquity, and lies so obviously on the surface of Scripture, that one can hardly conceive a simple, unlearned reader giving any other turn to the discourse in that chapter, unless he were prepossessed by a theory."

CHAPTER III

THE TWO PARTS OF CHRIST'S DISCOURSE

OUR Lord was wont to give a setting or frame to His discourses by some circumstance or miracle which would be illustrative of them. He connects His teaching of Himself, as the Resurrection and the Life, with the raising of Lazarus. He restores the man born blind and then reproves the blindness of the Pharisees who will not come to Him for light. He tells Nicodemus of the new birth by the Spirit, which is to take us out of our natural state of darkness, as the Ruler comes to Him by night, and the wind coming and going as it will is heard surging without. It is at Samaria's well, to the sin-convicted heart-sore woman, He declares Himself the Living Water. In like manner He lays the foundation of His teaching concerning Himself as the Bread of Life. He gives the

blessed loaves into the hands of the Apostles and the bread lessens not in their hands as they distribute it to the multitude. It grows as they give. He comes walking upon the waves and joins His disciples in the ship and the ship is immediately at land. Christ thus declares how His bodily Presence with His disciples in the ship of the Church is not controlled by natural laws.

Bishop Wordsworth has embalmed this truth for us in one of his poems:

"Lord, in Thy Sacraments
Thou walkest on the sea;
Let us not ask — how dost Thou come?
But gladly welcome Thee.

"Then will the winds be hushed,
The waves no longer roar;
When Christ is with us in the ship,
The ship is at the shore."

These miracles are not only a proof of Christ's ability to be present in the Eucharist, but are moreover one proof of His Presence. For if the consecrated elements are only empty symbols, there is nothing of a supernatural character about them, and so these miracles, which form the framework of our Lord's teaching on the Eucharist, would be inappropriate and unmeaning. These miracles, so full of the sovereignty of Christ over the natural world, are full of joy and assurance to the believer's heart. Christ's blessed Body is not controlled as ours are by the conditions of space and time, but

is capable for moral purposes of dominating them. Within the spiritual organism of His Church we sit, as famishing children at His feet, and are being fed with Himself as the Living Bread from Heaven.

The first and most important thing to notice concerning the discourse itself in the sixth chapter of St. John is that it is divided into two parts.

It was delivered in the Synagogue at Capernaum. The remains of the beautiful white Synagogue built of white limestone show that there was a large pot of manna sculptured on it. Doubtless excitedly pointing to this, His hearers said, "What sign shewest Thou then, that we may see, and believe Thee? — Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from Heaven to eat." Jesus then began His instruction with this powerful exordium: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread *from Heaven;* but *My Father* giveth you the true Bread *from Heaven.* For the Bread of God is He which cometh down from Heaven and giveth life unto the world."

Having thus begun His great discourse, He lays down His basic proposition: "And Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life."

It would be well for our readers here to take their New Testaments, and mark St. John vi:32 with the figure *one.* It will help them much to have their New Testaments before them and to read this section. This part ends probably with the 47th verse. It ends with this very appropriate perora-

tion: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life."

The second part begins with verse 48. It would be well to mark this with the figure *two* in Roman numerals. It is not without interest in examining our Lord's discourses to find that He not unfrequently makes such a division. Thus in St. John xv. He begins: "I am the true vine," and states the consequences of not abiding in Himself. Then He begins the second part (v. 5) and repeating nearly the same words, "I am the vine," declares the fruits that ensue from abiding in Him.

So in His discourse on Himself as the Good Shepherd we find Him (ch. x:11) saying "I am the Good Shepherd," and of His laying down His life for the sheep, and then (verse 14) repeating His text, "I am the Good Shepherd," going on to state the relation existing between the sheep and Himself.

So we find Him here in the sixth chapter of St. John, saying in an early part of the first division of His discourse, "I am the Bread of Life," and bringing out one set of truths, and then beginning the second part at verse 48 with the very same words, "I am the Bread of Life," and bringing out another and quite different set of truths. "Christ," says an able writer, "speaks of two things in this chapter: first of the general fact of His Mediation and that His Humanity was the medium through which Divine graces found their way to mankind; secondly, that the eating His Body and drinking His Blood

was the method in which this gift was to be participated in by individuals."

Now it is from persons not noticing this division that most of the misunderstanding about this discourse has come. Not seeing that entirely different truths are treated of in each portion of the discourse, persons have arbitrarily applied texts in the first part to the interpretation of those in the second, and so have failed of the right meaning. Let us therefore analyze these two parts and learn the differences between them.

In each there are three points. The Donor of a great gift, the Gift itself, and then the exhortation and practical Duty enjoined in respect of it.

In the first part the Donor is the Eternal Father. It is said (vs. 32) "*My Father* giveth you the true Bread from Heaven." Six times the Father is mentioned; and our Lord twice declares that it is the Father who hath sent Him.

The Gift in this part is Christ Himself. "For the bread of God is He which cometh down from Heaven and giveth life unto the world."

The Duty inculcated is to believe in Him. "Verily, verily, he that believeth in Me hath everlasting life."

In the second part all this is changed. Now it is not the Father who is the donor, but Christ. The giver is seen to be another person. Christ says again, "I am the Bread of Life." Previously He had said this, and then shown how He was this Bread of Life *as sent from Heaven.* Now He says,

"I am the Bread of Life," as having Life in Himself and capable of communicating It. "I am the Living (or Life-giving) Bread." But, notice the change of donor of the gift: "The Bread that *I will give* is My Flesh." Not only is the donor a different person, but so is the gift a different thing. The gift in the first place was Christ, given or sent by the Father. Now it is Christ's Flesh and Blood, given by Himself. Again, the duty first inculcated was that of faith, to believe in Him whom the Father had sent. The duty in the second is to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. Of this nothing was previously said. It presents a new and unique duty. "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life." "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me and I in him." "He that eateth Me, even He shall live by Me."

Again a fourth difference is this: The duty first declared was one immediately to be performed. Then and there they were called on to believe in Him. The duty in the second place was remote. "The Bread that I *will give* is My Flesh for the life of the world." "The participation," says the Speakers Commentary, "is spoken of as still future, since it followed in its fullness on the completed work of Christ." Dean Alford also declares "it is His Flesh which He *will give* on behalf of the world." Thrice "had it been said," says Stier, "I am Myself

the Bread, and now is added with a change — the bread which He *will* give. He distinguishes from Himself who is Bread, the Bread which he *will give*." In the first part there is an immediate duty to be performed, in the second it is future and remote.

Moreover a fifth difference is to be seen in that the effects produced in the two cases are of a different character. Christ's hearers were first called on to come to Him, to believe in Him. Yet as Stier well says: "With all the believing of those who believed in Him, He *came not as yet unto their souls*. So that the Apostles could only avow, standing as yet without and as it were over against Him, Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." But the fruit of the faithful reception of His Flesh was that He would come *into* them and abide with them. He that eateth Me shall live by Me. He speaks in the last section of that wonderful incorporation into His Humanity by which we are made partakers of the divine Nature.

A further proof that the subject has been changed is thus seen in the different effects assigned to the respective gifts. To each is attributed (vv. 40, 44, 47, 54, 58), in general, the being raised at the last day, and eternal life. But while resurrection and life are the result of our union with Christ, we are united to Him both by faith and sacramental grace. By faith we lay hold of Him, by sacramental grace He lays hold of us. In the first part of the discourse, we are called on to come to Christ

and believe in Him whom the Father hath sent. We lay hold of Him. In the second part, we are to eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, that He may abide in us and we in Him. The effects assigned to the respective gifts are thus seen to be different, and the division in the discourse yet more clearly marked.

Lastly, it must be noticed that, in the first division of His sermon, Christ never uses the word "eat." Although He uses the metaphor of Bread, and says He is the Bread that came down from heaven, yet He never says, "Eat this Bread." He might have done so conformably to the duty He sought to inculcate. If He had used this word and figure in the first part, we should have understood Him *of faith.* The receiving of wisdom, under the figure of eating Bread, as we shall presently show, was a common one. The disciples would have readily understood this figure of speech. But it is very significant that our Lord there avoids using it. Even when His hearers, on His proclaiming Himself to be the true Bread given by the Father from heaven, said, "Lord, evermore give us this Bread," He avoids bidding them "eat" of this Bread. He will only repeat again and again the duty of believing in Him. Now the contrast between this careful avoidance of the word *eat* in the first part, and the continued repetition of this injunction to *eat* in the second part, shows again that the subject is changed.

From what has been said, the fact is now easily

recognized by our readers that our Lord's discourse is divided into two parts. There could hardly be internal evidence more decisive or complete. There are five differences between the two sections, and these affect their whole character and meaning. The donors of the separate gifts, the gifts themselves, their modes of appropriation, the times when they are to be made ours, and the spiritual effects of either, are all unlike. However cautious in giving our assent, we may, therefore, accept this division of the discourse as now demonstrated.

There are two corollaries, or consequences, that follow from this fact. Our readers can now see for themselves how those miss the correct meaning, who, not discerning the division, apply texts from the first part, which most properly inculcate faith in Christ as our duty, to the command in the second part to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. Yet how often have we heard or read of such a strange mixture of texts to elucidate the meaning. A preacher will take for his text, "The bread that I will give is My Flesh," or "except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you," and then give, as an explanation, a passage from the first discourse: "He that believeth in Me hath everlasting life." We all know we are to believe in Him, and so by the uncritical ear and mind, the explanation passes and is accepted, without examination. When we do pause to think, we see that the preacher is stringing texts together, taken out of their context, and which, though found

in the same discourse, have no real connection with one another. It is just as illogical, and the result just as absurd, as if we combined any other two diverse texts together. It would be equally convincing if we should say: It is written, "Judas went out and hanged himself," and then quote the text, "Go thou and do likewise."

The other deduction from the fact that the discourse is a dual one is that the last section relates to the Eucharist and declares the Real Presence in a most solemn and emphatic manner. Convinced that here we have Christ's own teaching about His Sacrament, we can but be awed in the presence of His divine utterances and plainness of speech. Who are we, specks of dust upon a planetary speck, and where all is marvellous, to stumble at a marvel? Without good reason none should change their opinions, but not to change on fair showing is to be most unreasonable. The wise man rectifies his opinions by the wisdom of the wise. Let us sit at the feet of no human masters nor make idols of times or men. We must not exalt reformers into deities, nor take mediævalism as a model. Let us go back to Christ. Let us accept His word in all its plainness and literal meaning. "What the Truth hath spoken, that for Truth I hold,"

> "Christ was the Word who spake it.
> He took the Bread and brake it,
> And what that Word did make it,
> That I believe and take it."

CHAPTER IV

THE TWO METAPHORS

THE popular argument for disbelief in the Real Presence is that since our Lord, in the thirty-fifth verse, says, "I am the Bread of Life; he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst," He means nothing different when He subsequently says, "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh," and "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you."

In the first instance Christ calls on us to believe in Him whom the Father has sent, and so it is assumed very superficially that all that is intended by the second injunction is to do the same thing. Now we have destroyed any logical force that might belong to such an argument, by proving that the discourse consists of two distinct parts — the Giver and the Gift; and the Duty in each case being different, consequently what is said in one part cannot be applied to the other.

But in addition to all these arguments there is a further one which we think must be convincing to every reasonable mind. The two parts of the discourse are separated by a very remarkable change of language. If, for the sake of argument, we regard them both as metaphors, as we are obliged to do if we deny that our Lord's words in the latter part of His discourse are to be taken literally, we

must also take into account the fact that these two figures of speech are absolutely unlike and have two different significations. And yet this is so seldom pointed out in our popular commentaries that it is but little known. It is not often dwelt upon in sermons. Very few of our communicants have had the opportunity given them of considering it. This is one cause of the ignorance of the Church's children on the subject.

The two expressions used by our Lord are these: In the one case He speaks of Himself as the Bread of Life and says, "He that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." In the other case He speaks of "eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood." Now these, regarded as metaphors, were, as such, well known to the Jews to whom Christ was speaking, and they meant two entirely different and distinct things.

Under the first metaphor our Lord speaks of Himself, who was the Eternal Wisdom, as bread or food. This figure of speech is found in Isaiah (lv. 1, 2): "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. . . . Hearken diligently unto Me, and eat ye that which is good." The same image is found in Jeremiah (xv. 16): "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart." In Proverbs (ix. 5), we have wisdom

personified saying, "Come, eat of My bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled." So in Ecclesiasticus (xv. 3): "With the bread of understanding she shall feed him, and give him the water of wisdom to drink." The same figure is used by the prophet Amos (viii. 11): "Behold, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord." These examples show that it was a common and well understood figure of speech to represent truths or doctrines under the image of bread.

This was the figure used by our Lord in the first part of His instruction. He asserted that He was the Bread from Heaven, but made it particularly plain that what He called on the Jews to do was to believe in Him. It is also evident that His hearers had no difficulty in so understanding Him. They raised no objection to this figure, which presented no difficulty to their minds or hearts. What they did object to was the claim He made of having Himself been sent by the Father and of "coming down from Heaven." "Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that He saith, I came down from Heaven?"

But our Lord, having summed up that portion of His sermon with a solemn "Verily, Verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life," proceeded to change the language, and now says, "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life."

Let us now consider the meaning of His new phrase.

It is a sound rule, in the interpretation of a speaker's language, to consider how he would necessarily be understood by those whom he addressed. Now just as wisdom might be called bread, and acceptance be regarded as feeding, the figures of "eating one's flesh," "drinking one's blood," had, at the time of our Lord, to the Jews, a recognized and established meaning. This metaphor, assuming it to be such, had its own signification, just as the other had. It was indelibly stamped upon it by Jewish literature and common use. What was it?

"To eat one's flesh" meant to do an injury to a person.

"In every instance," says Dr. Cleaver, formerly Bishop of Chester (Sermon, p. 29), "in which to eat a person's flesh is spoken of in scripture, to injure or destroy the party referred to, is the idea conveyed. So it is in Psalm xxvii. 2: 'When the wicked came upon me to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell.' And so does St. James use it: 'The rust of them shall eat your flesh, as it were fire.' No single case can be produced either from classical or oriental sources in which this phrase is used in any other sense than that of consuming or preying on the person spoken of. Gesenius, who was a great authority in Semitic languages, gives these as the sole interpretation of the phrase, 'to eat any one's flesh.' Nor is this extraordinary;

for metaphorical language is the language of nature, and must have a counterpart in those realities of which it is the expression. Now to ruminate upon and digest the instructions of another is an easy and obvious metaphor, but to *eat* the body and *drink* the blood of your teacher bears no conceivable analogy to any benefit to be received from thence."

We will quote one other learned authority, Dr. Wiseman, noted for his oriental learning: "The expression in the twenty-seventh psalm, 'eat My flesh,' describes the violent rage of David's enemies and the lengths they were ready to go against him. Again in Micah iii. 3, we have, 'Who also eat the flesh of My people.' In Ecc. iv. 5, we find the mischief which a foolish man does to himself described by the same figurative phrase: 'The fool foldeth his arms together and eateth his own flesh.' . . . 'Among the Arabs to this day and from time immemorial, to eat the flesh of a person means figuratively to calumniate him.' We find the same meaning in the language which our Saviour Himself spoke and which was vernacular among the Jews whom He addressed. In Chaldaic the most common expression to accuse falsely or calumniate is to eat a morsel of the flesh of a person. In Syriac it is exactly the same. Whether, therefore, we consult the phraseology of Scripture, the spirit and ideas of the Semitic nations, or the current use of language employed by our Saviour, we find the expression to eat the flesh of a person had an established metaphorical meaning."

The argument to be drawn from the change of language in the two parts of the discourse we submit is most clear and convincing. For while in the first part we find our Lord using a phrase perfectly adapted to convey the idea that His hearers were to believe in Him, in the second part, if faith is still his subject, He is found needlessly changing the metaphor. He brings in an entirely new one. Why should He do this if His meaning in the second part was only the same as, or an amplification of, the first? He had clearly and urgently taught them the duty of accepting and believing in Him. Why, if the same duty of faith was, in both parts of His discourse, being inculcated, did he change the metaphor? Having once made His meaning perfectly clear, as their reply to Him showed, why should He obscure it? No earthly teacher possessed of common sense would commit such a rhetorical blunder. "The Lord never explained," says the Protestant, Stier, "any more than any reasonable man among ourselves, a figurative saying by a new figure."

And why, moreover, should He take a metaphor which would be so misleading? The metaphor to eat a person's flesh had a fixed, determinate significance. His hearers were therefore forced to do one of two things. They were forced either to understand Christ — who just before was telling them that He was sent by the Father, sent from Heaven itself, sent to give life to the world, and who was pleading with them with all the force of

a divine entreaty, to come to Him and believe — they were forced now to understand Him as saying they must reject Him, and hate Him, and calumniate Him, with the rage of those who, in their bitterest language, would eat His flesh, or they must take His words in their plain, literal sense. So evident is this that Stier says: "By the words 'My flesh,' Christ does not mean, My Person, My power and influence, My Spirit, yea not even My Body, but absolutely and no other than what it says, 'My Flesh.'"

Can we Churchmen doubt which of the alternatives Christ intended His hearers or us to take? Consider this further fact. The idea of drinking blood was something abhorrent to the Jewish mind. It was something criminal, forbidden by God's express command. "Whatever man there be of the house of Israel that eateth any manner of blood, I will set My face against that soul and will cut him off from among his people." It was not only an abhorrent idea, but a criminal act of the greatest magnitude. Can we then suppose that our Lord, having stated one of His most beneficent doctrines, that of coming to Himself by faith, should now turn round and put it in the most revolting form possible, and that in a way that involved the committing of crime? You exclaim, Impossible!

What then are we to conclude? Either our Lord intended here to teach that actual feeding involved in the doctrine of His Real Presence in the Sacrament, or He did not. If He did not, He

violated all the laws that govern intelligible teaching. He put unnecessary obstacles in the way of His hearers' understanding Him. He put His most loving doctrine of faith in a most repulsive form. He acted also contrary to the known principles of His character. He never repelled nor drove away any whom He could reach. Most loving invitations again and again had He issued to poor, and sick, and halt, and blind, and heavy laden, and sin-bound, to come to Him and only believe. Now, according to this theory, He is no longer the consistent Teacher and loving Shepherd; He is by a harsh and unnecessary metaphor putting a stumbling-block in the way of belief, when, on belief, His hearers' everlasting life depended!

Against such a conclusion every Christian instinct revolts. We must all say, It is impossible! If He changed from the earlier metaphor, He does so because the truth He had to teach compelled Him to do so; because in the supreme interests of truth and men's souls, He must declare in plain language the necessity of an actual incorporation into His humanity, that we might thereby be partakers of His divine nature, and rise through union with Him into the Eternal Life.

CHAPTER V

HOW CHRIST MEANT TO BE UNDERSTOOD

WE now proceed to another and most decisive proof that our Lord in the latter part of His discourse spoke of the gift of His Body and Blood to be partaken of in the Eucharist. We have in the discourse itself a most certain proof as to how our Lord intended His words to be understood. Let us see what the proof is.

The object of any teacher is to convey his meaning as lucidly as possible, and he will be careful according to the importance of his subject not to be misunderstood. When a body of earnest listeners all agree as to what a speaker has taught, there is little doubt as to what he said. But when the speaker is a Divine Teacher and knows perfectly what He wants to convey, and is possessed of the best possible means of making it clear and intelligible, and moreover sees into the minds of His hearers and is thus aware of the impression given, then their agreement as to His teaching shows what most probably He purposed to teach. But further, when the hearers publicly declare to the Teacher Himself the sense in which they have understood Him, we can arrive at a demonstration as to what He taught and meant by His words. For either they have understood Him rightly, or they have not. And the Teacher has then the opportunity either of correcting them if they have

misunderstood His doctrine, or of confirming their impression regarding it.

Now in the present case we find that the Jews had perfectly understood our Lord in the first part of His discourse. They found no difficulty in the common metaphor which made wisdom to be bread. Their objection, then, was that Christ claimed to have been sent by the Father and to have come from Heaven. But now He has said He would give them His Flesh to eat. They, understanding Him literally, now ask this question: "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" It is plain, therefore, how they understood Him. They understood Him to speak literally and to refer to an actual manducation. The question, then, is whether they were right or wrong in so doing. This question is answered by Christ Himself. Let us see how He answered it.

Every teacher has his own methods of conveying his instruction, and so had Christ. Let us in the interest of truth examine His general method of teaching and see if we can extract any rule from it that will guide us here to a solution. How then did He act in similar circumstances? When He meant to be taken figuratively and His hearers misunderstood Him as speaking literally, how did He ordinarily reply? When, on the other hand, He meant to be taken literally, and they took Him figuratively or objected to the literal meaning, how then was He wont to act? If we can find any rule that governs His teaching in such cases, it will

greatly help us to determine the question how Christ intended to be understood.

Now it appears, that when our Lord intended to be understood figuratively and His hearers gave a literal meaning to His words, His custom was, like that of any wise teacher, to explain them. One example of this is found in the case of Lazarus. Christ said to His Apostles, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth." The Apostles, mistaking His meaning and taking Him literally, replied, "Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well." Then our Lord corrected them. It was not of natural bodily sleep He spoke. Then said Jesus plainly unto them, "Lazarus is dead." Again our Lord said to His disciples, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." They supposed He was speaking literally and "thought within themselves saying, Because we have taken no bread." Then our Lord explained His meaning. It was not of natural food He was speaking. "Why do ye not understand that it is not concerning bread I said to you, Beware, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees?" At the Samaria well, our Lord said, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." Here again the disciples took His words literally. They asked one another, "Hath any man brought Him aught to eat?" Then Jesus corrected their error and put the moral truth involved in His figurative language before them. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me and to finish His work." When on another occasion Jesus said, "Whither I go ye

cannot come," the Jews fell into the same mistake. They took His words as implying that He would "kill Himself." Then Christ removes their gross material conception of His words. "You are from beneath; I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world."

Again, our Lord said to Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Taking Him literally, the ruler replied, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" Then Christ did away with the mistaken literal sense and answered, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." From these and other like examples we see that when our Lord, speaking in a figurative sense, was taken in a literal one, He removed the mistake by explaining His meaning.

Now let us consider the other class of cases. We will suppose Him to have spoken literally and meant to be so understood. How does He now act when objection is made? We shall find that His ordinary rule is to state the truth right over again and even in more forcible language. The following examples are illustrative of this.

Christ had said to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad." Taking His words literally and declarative of his being coeval with their great patriarch, they

scornfully replied, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?" Our Lord had not meant that Abraham only in prophetic vision had gazed down the ages and seen His advent. He meant to assert what His auditors understood Him to claim, that He was contemporaneous with Abraham. He therefore does not explain, as He does when His words have been misunderstood. But with solemn grandeur declares what, if not true, would be blasphemy, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am."

Again, when the roof had been removed and the palsied man let down before Him, Jesus said, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." The Jews were shocked at the tremendous claim this utterance involved. They very naturally said, "This man blasphemeth." In what sense was He uttering those words? What was the explanation of them? Our Lord meant what He literally said. He therefore repeated the obnoxious language as it was: "Which is easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Rise up and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith He to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine house."

When our Lord purified the Temple, they asked Him, "What sign showest Thou unto us?" Our Lord referred to the one Jonah-like sign of His Resurrection. Pointing perhaps to His Body, which by a common figure He called a temple, He said,

"Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up," for "He spake of the temple of His Body." They said perversely, it took forty and six years to erect that building before them. But our Lord makes no explanation. He meant concerning His Resurrection to be taken literally.

We have another instance of our Lord's method in the very discourse before us. He had asserted that He "came down from Heaven." Literally taken, the Jews said this was impossible and untrue. "Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" How is it then that He saith, "I came down from Heaven"? Our Lord bids them not murmur at this. He asserts again and again that He is "the living Bread which came down from Heaven," and that as a proof of it, "Ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before."

We have discovered Christ's method of teaching. Let us apply it to the present case. He has asserted that He will give His Flesh for the life of the world. The Jews, taking Him literally, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His flesh to eat? What was the Lord's reply? Did He say, Do not understand Me literally? Did He put His teaching in some other less objectionable form? Did He act as He did in all those other cases where His hearers, taking Him literally, made a mistake in so doing? Or did He act as in those cases where, having spoken literally and objection being made, He intended to be taken literally? He replied, as

in these latter cases. He answered, saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you."

Put the following three parallel cases side by side. They illustrate our Lord's method. They leave no doubt of our Lord's meaning in the present case.

St. John iii. 3

"Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God."

St. John viii. 56

"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it and was glad."

St. John vi. 51

"If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

In each of these cases, objections were raised.

In the first, Nicodemus understood our Lord literally. Verse 4: "Nicodemus saith to Him, How can a man be born again when he is old?"

In the second case, "then said the Jews unto Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?"

In the third, "the Jews therefore strove among themselves saying, How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?"

In the first case where our Lord's words were taken literally, and He meant to be taken otherwise, He explained: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water

and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

In the second case, where His words were taken literally and He meant them so to be taken, He repeated His statement: "Jesus said to them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am."

In the third case, in answer to the objection, like as in the second, He repeated His teaching and in the most solemn way: "Then Jesus said to them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you."

There are three other points that may be noticed in regard to His reply.

First, Christ not only asserts the literal meaning, but confirms it with a solemn asseveration, or as some commentators call it, an oath, by a twice repeated Verily, verily.

Secondly, He enforces the literal meaning and the necessity of an actual reception of His Body and Blood in both a negative and positive form. One can but be struck by the similarity of this double negative and positive form of precept with that given in respect to the other great sacrament of Baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." So in regard to the Eucharist, first, the injunction is put negatively: "Except ye eat the Flesh and drink the Blood, ye have no life in you." There is thus first stated the awful loss of not doing

so. Then there is positively stated the benefits ensuing on reception: "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

Thirdly, We must notice that Christ not only repeats and reaffirms His words and does it with a Verily, verily, but declares that His Flesh is true meat and His Blood true drink: "For My Flesh is meat indeed and My Blood is drink indeed." Could any reassertion be possibly more distinct or more emphatic?

Tested, therefore, by the divine Master's own method of teaching, we find that the Jews understood Him rightly as proposing to give them His very Flesh for food, and by His answer He confirmed them in their belief. He meant to be thus understood by them.

And so too, within the Church He founded and which His Spirit guides, for all these centuries, His words have been so received by the great majority of all His followers. It is a terrible dilemma, but a decisive one, that here presents itself to us. He could not have been a Teacher sent from God, if He so badly taught His doctrine as to lead so great a number of His disciples into serious error. Again, there is no Holy Spirit, if He has not safeguarded the words of Christ and guided the Church into the right understanding of them. Between the multitudinous and conflicting opinions of human wisdom, the trembling magnet of Catholic consent points securely to the pole-fixed star of Truth. The result

of Christ's teaching shows how Christ intended to be understood.

CHAPTER VI

THE REAL ISSUE

OUR LORD was struggling with all the intensity of His divine love to win those whom He addressed. He needed to win them to a complete surrender to Himself if their conversion was to be worth anything. Simply to gain their intellectual assent to any truths He might promulgate would be of no spiritual profit unless there was the submission of their whole nature. It will be of no profit to us to believe in Christ's life and death as if they were mere facts of history, or in the scheme of redemption as we might accept a theory of light or sound. Such belief can never unite to Christ nor save a soul.

Nor will it save us to try and be Christ-like. The copyist of Christ does not thereby become a Christian. Oh, the folly of this self-improvement religion, with Christ for a model only! He must be the Moulder and we the clay in His hands. Christ seeks to bring our whole being into this entire captivity to Himself. To be savingly His, we must on our part surrender ourselves wholly to Him, and believe all He says, because He says it. We must be ready to do all He calls us to do, because He bids it. To be savingly His, on His part, we must be incorporated into Him by His gifts of

grace. He is the Head and Beginning of a New Creation. We must, to share in it, be in Him and He in us. We in Him, and so saved by Him. He in us, and we remade by Him.

Now Christ in this contest for His hearers' souls was struggling first to bring them to the submissive temper of heart and mind that would accept Him. If saving faith was to be developed within them, He must not demonstrate His truths beyond the possibility of a mental rejection. But He must so teach and with all His suggestive wisdom as to compel them to make a choice. They must, in the presence of the difficulty as to how He could perform His promise, choose or reject Him. They must, as we all must, to become His, make a venture of faith. They must surrender heart and mind and will to Him and let Him own them wholly. The issue He now presented was either to reject Him, or to accept Him by believing what He said.

We know what the result was. All the Apostles, save Judas, — a most significant and dreadful warning, believed. They heard Christ's promise to give them to eat of His Flesh and to drink His Blood. Mysterious words indeed, but clearly understood. When our Lord turned in Love's great anxiety and put the final test: "Will ye also go away?" Simon Peter, their spokesman, answered for them and said: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." They could not understand how it could be, but they were ready to believe every-

thing and anything He said. Oh! what joy thrilled the heart of Jesus as they reached this triumphant act of faith.

With Judas and others it was not so. That they understood Him literally is clear. It is clear also that He meant so to be understood. Turning, however, away from the Christ, they said: "This is a hard saying." It was not hard in the sense that they could not understand what He said, but hard as being repulsive, harsh, revolting. Yet our Lord, with all His persistent tenderness, will not thus let them depart. He will yet strive, and to the utmost, to win them to a self-surrendering trust in Himself. He knows in Himself how they are murmuring at His teaching. He will make a final effort to overcome their deep-rooted objections. Let us see how He does this.

In this final effort, Jesus in His conclusion deals with their two great objections made during the progress of this whole discourse. The objection they raised to the claim made under the first head of this discourse was that He had come down from Heaven; and the objection made to His statement, under the second head, that having so come He could give them His Flesh to eat, was its seeming impossibility.

Replying in His summary to both, Jesus said: "Doth this offend you?" Then He takes up their objections *seriatim*. He replies to their first objection by saying He will give them an ocular demonstration of His coming down from Heaven.

"What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?"

He here by this statement asserts His pre-existence, "where He was before." And He states that He will prove His descent from that position or condition by a visible return to it. They did not believe He had entered the world in any manner different from their own. "Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that He saith, I came down from Heaven?" To have previously existed and have come down from Heaven was to make claim to a supernatural entrance into this world. To be also the Son of Man implied a supernatural human birth. All that our Lord's words involved they did not comprehend, but the bare claim to have come down from Heaven was what troubled them. Our Lord, therefore, says He will remove their difficulty by giving them an ocular proof and visibly ascend in the presence of His disciples. His supernatural exit would thus be a proof of His claim to a supernatural entrance. When they saw it, what would they then say? Then they would assuredly say what He desired them to believe now: that He had come from Heaven.

To their second objection, "How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?" our Lord replies, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing."

There are three interpretations proposed for the text, and it is but fair to give them all.

The one given by those who deny the Real Presence is that this text shows our Lord's words are to be taken spiritually, not literally. It is true that "the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." It is true that Christians "are not under the letter, but serve in newness of spirit." But the term *flesh*, which is the word here to be interpreted, never in Holy Scripture means the letter or literal sense of words. There are thus two fatal objections to the exegesis. The word *flesh* is never employed as synonymous for the literal meaning, and again our Lord does here refer to His flesh. Our Lord, to quote Alford, does not say, "My Flesh profiteth nothing, but the flesh. To make Him say My Flesh, as the anti-sacramentalists do, is to make Him contradict His own words."

The second interpretation is given by a number of Protestant and Catholic commentators. Flesh and spirit when opposed in Holy Scripture are found referring to our unregenerate human nature and our spiritually enlightened one. Our Lord discriminates between the two: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." These are opposed to each other. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and they are contrary the one to the other." There is the mind of the flesh, "Ye judge after the flesh," says our Lord. There is the mind of the spirit, by which alone spiritual things are discerned. The result of the two operations is thus contrasted: "To be car-

nally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." Our Lord, according to this interpretation, is telling His auditors that His words cannot be understood by the dim light of human reason, but only by it as it is spiritually enlightened. This interpretation is consistent with belief in the Real Presence.

The third interpretation is more simple, and it is far better designed to meet the objection raised. By the word "flesh," Christ means human flesh, just such as His hearers had. By "spirit" He refers to man's spirit. Elsewhere in Holy Scripture (II Cor. vii. 1) the two, "flesh and spirit," are joined together. Christ thus bases His reply on a fact of which they are cognizant. They are composed of flesh and spirit, and He says it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The flesh by itself, as they knew, had no quickening or life-communicating power. Without the spirit within it, it would be lifeless or dead. It is the spirit that makes flesh, living flesh, and capable of communicating, in the natural order, life.

It is the same He asserts in regard to His nature. Only My nature, He would say to them, is not like yours. I came from heaven. Your mistake arises from not believing what I had first to teach you. You take Me for a man like one of yourselves. But My Flesh is united to My divine Spiritual Nature. Just as your ordinary human flesh is made life-giving in the natural order, because of the soul or spirit with which it is connected, so My Flesh and

Blood can communicate life of a higher and spiritual order, on account of the Eternal Spiritual Nature with which they are connected. St. Cyril says: "For after the Life-giving Word of God made His dwelling in our flesh, He transformed it to His own Virtue, that is, Life. Thereupon the Body of Christ quickens those who partake in it."

And here let us point out a common mistake which has been the occasion of much misunderstanding. In our English version we have the phrase, "The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life." It is to be noted that the Greek has two uses, *logos*, a word, and *ta remata*, things spoken or done. The use here is not *logos*, but *ta remata*, the things about which I have been speaking.

This makes plain our Lord's response and shows how completely and fully He met His hearers' objections. He said, The things that I have been speaking about to you, viz., My Body and My Blood, by virtue of their connection with My Divine Spiritual Nature, They are spirit and They are life. The first man, as St. Paul tells us, is of the earth, earthy. The second man, the Head of the New Creation, is the Lord from heaven. "The first man Adam was made a living soul" and could only communicate natural life. "The last Adam," by virtue of union with Divinity, "was made a quickening Spirit," capable of communicating to us divine spiritual life.

We can now better understand why Christ laid such emphasis on receiving both the Flesh and

Blood. If faith was all He wished to form within us, it could have been developed by an act of reception in one kind. But if we are to be incorporated into Him who both died and rose again, the fitness of a reception in both kinds is manifest.

It may not be deemed prolix if we dwell on this blessing so lovingly preserved to us in our communion. Under the law the Israelite was forbidden to taste of blood. For the blood was, he was told, associated with the animal life principle. "The blood is the life thereof." Man, being by transgression under the law of sin and death, was forbidden to take of that which was the symbol of grace and life. But when Christ, the Life, came, the command was changed. Now it is, "Drink ye all of It." For the Blood of Christ by its union with His Eternal Spiritual Nature is possessed of a quickening power. He, through His own "Eternal Spirit" (which does not here mean the Holy Spirit), "offered Himself without spot to God." His Blood therefore was, by reason of its union with His Spiritual Nature, endued with a spiritual power. Its power is capable of penetrating, as we read, to the innermost portion of man's spiritual nature. It can purge his conscience from dead works, works done without grace, and make it serve acceptably the Living God. Such is its mighty and spiritual power. May we not be thankful that we can separately partake both of that Blessed Blood that was shed and that Flesh that was triumphant over death?

We can in conclusion draw a comparison between the character and conduct of our Lord as presented to us by the two views we have been considering. In Christ all virtues are wonderfully blended. None are wanting in their highest excellency. None but what is balanced by other excellencies. As a Teacher He is the most wonderful the world has seen, for He is Wisdom Itself. He is the Truth inflexible in His condemnation of error, most tenderly skilful in enlightening the ignorant. He is the Good Shepherd who will leave naught untried that love can suggest to win the sinner's heart and mind.

We have seen Him, if His object was to teach the reception of His very Body and Blood, acting consistently with the usual method of His teaching and with His character. With what clearness, what firm reiteration, what solemn asseveration, what merciful severity, He declares His doctrine. How wisely He stoops to His hearers' infirmities and meets their real objections. How majestically He prophesies His coming Ascension as the demonstration of His heavenly descent. How convincingly He declares His Body to be unlike common flesh (which would profit nothing), because It is possessed of Spirit and Life.

His loving toil was successful. Many might go back whom He did not win. But the great heart of St. Peter stood rock-like and firm, and the Apostles were with him. The foundation of belief in that transcendent gift of Christ to the Church, her joy

and treasure, the support of her children in their warfare and toil, their comfort and viaticum in the hour of death, was then securely and forever laid.

But if Christ made no such promise of a veiled but abiding Presence, if the Church is to wander through the world's wilderness without even Israel's Shekinah, if Christ's words are not to be taken in their plain, literal sense, how does His conduct conform to the otherwise known features of His character? We find Him endeavouring to teach His followers that He has come from Heaven and is the Bread of Life. They make no objection to the metaphor. But then to their astonishment He needlessly changes it. He substitutes one of a most revolting and criminal kind. When they naturally object, He, but in more painful terms, reiterates it. He leaves them in their misunderstanding of His teaching and lets them go away from Him. Is such conduct consistent with His Mission as the Light of the World? With His method as the "Great Prophet and Teacher"? With His character as the Good Shepherd?

Which then of the two interpretations shall we take? That which is consistent with the course of any wise teacher, or that which contradicts ordinary common sense? That which is consistent with the whole life of our beloved Lord and Master, or that which convicts Him of having led, not only those who heard Him, but the great proportion of His followers, into a fatal, if not idolatrous, error?

The real issue to-day is just what it was when Christ spoke this discourse. It is: Do we believe in Him and all He says, because He says it? Or, do we reject Him in rejecting His words? Shall we go away and continue in our misbelief, or shall we submit with blessed St. Peter and the Apostles? Bending from His throne on high, Jesus puts the question to each one of us. Belief in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood is now the test of a living faith. What shall be our answer to the Lord? May the response go up from our whole Church, like the sound of mighty waters, gladdening the Divine Heart of our dear Master and Lord, "O Lord! we believe in Thee, and Thy Sacramental Presence with us, for Thou hast the words of Eternal Life."

CHAPTER VII

THE CORROBORATIVE TESTIMONY OF ST. PAUL

IN the Gospel of St. John we have the teaching concerning the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist before its formal institution. We naturally ask how it was regarded by the Apostles after Christ's Ascension. At Pentecost they received the abiding gift of the Holy Spirit, who was to bring to their remembrance all things that they had heard of Christ and to lead them into all truth. Of the importance they assigned to the Eucharist and its recognized position

as the great act of Christian worship, there can be no question. We find the Apostles at the founding of the Church, in that fair upper chamber "in the house" (not from house to house), celebrating daily. At Antioch, the next prominent centre after Jerusalem, the great missionary movement towards the Gentile world is inaugurated by a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost, "as they ministered unto the Lord," or were celebrating the Holy Communion.

Very soon the Eucharistic liturgy began to be developed and the first day of the week came to be called the Lord's Day, and was solemnized by this act of worship. Upon the first day of the week we read that the disciples came together "to break bread," and the "Breaking of Bread" was one of the earliest titles of the Sacrament.

For the received belief of the Apostles we have concerning it the remarkable testimony of St. Paul. It is remarkable because, not being one of the original Twelve, he is an independent witness. To him the ascended Lord appeared on the Damascus highway, and as He had called and commissioned the others, called and commissioned him to be an Apostle. As upon the Twelve the Holy Ghost at Pentecost came and consecrated those previously called, so did the Holy Ghost specially manifest Himself at Antioch, and said: "Separate Me Barnabas and Saul." Thus St. Paul, not as an apostle of men or as empowered by man, but as called and commissioned by Jesus Christ and the

Holy Ghost, was set apart with laying on of hands and received into the apostolic fellowship.

To him our Lord made a special communication concerning the Holy Communion. He must have learned from the other Apostles how to baptize with water and in the Name of the Blessed Trinity, for we know on occasions he did so. But the ascended Lord did not reveal this unto him; and perhaps to this he alludes when he says, "The Lord sent me not to baptize." But so transcendent was the divine institution of the Blessed Sacrament, that Christ after His Ascension made a special revelation concerning it. Just as Christ and the Holy Ghost had called an Apostle after Pentecost to show that They abode in the Church, and that the apostolic order was to be continued, for like reasons Christ made a revelation concerning the Eucharist. Christ would ever abide in His Church, and He would abide in it in that human nature which He had assumed and from which He would never be separated. If He had laid aside that nature, it would not have been possible for His priests to continue to say, "This is My Body"; for that Body would have ceased to exist. The Church after the Ascension was by these words to bear witness to the continuance of the Incarnation, and of Christ's Body and Blood being the source of His people's life.

Again, the Communion was not something instituted for a loving remembrance of Himself by those who had been with Him when visible in the flesh. It was to be continued. It was to be a

solemn memorial made before God by all Christians and for all time, to show forth the Lord's death "till He come."

St. Paul declares with great solemnity the command he had received from Christ: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread: And when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in My Blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come."

Here we have an independent testimony of our Lord's fulfilment of His promise in St. John, to give to all the disciples to the end of time His Flesh to eat and His Blood to drink. The account of the institution of the Communion agrees with that given in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke. We will fully consider the words of Institution later. Here let us note three most helpful statements that are peculiar to St. Paul.

First, we note with interest that while evidently referring to the consecrated element, he speaks of it as "this bread." He says, "as often as ye eat of this Bread." We thus find him calling the Sacrament *bread*. This agrees with the teaching of Christendom. The elements are not destroyed

or annihilated by the consecration. If they were, the character of a sacrament would be gone. There is an outward sign, as well as an inward part. They both truly exist. The assertion of the existence of the one does not imply the non-existence of the other. Speaking of the Sacrament we may say with the Fathers, It is the Body and Blood of Christ, or we may say referring to it, "This Bread," or "This Cup." It does not, however, follow from this ordinary use of language that no change has been effected by the consecration and that our Lord's Body and Blood are not sacramentally identified with the outward and visible signs.

No better proof of this can be found than in the Roman Liturgy itself. No one questions but that the Roman Church believes in the Real Presence. It states that doctrine in the strongest possible way. "Yet it is their custom," says Cardinal Wiseman, "to call the sacred elements by the names of their appearances after the consecration. In the canon of the Mass, we call them '*Panem sanctum via aeternae, et calicem salutis perpetuae.*' Again we say, '*panem coelestem accipiani.*' Now would any one seriously argue that we do not believe in the Real Presence and in Transubstantiation, because we speak of bread being still upon the altar after the consecration? Certainly not; for it is natural to call by this name the sacred Gift, both from its appearance and its properties. It can therefore be no more inferred from similar phraseology in St. Paul that he excluded our belief."

It may be further observed, that this usage is to be found in Holy Scripture which, in our tract, is our standard of appeal. In the ninth chapter of St. John we have a very full account given of our Lord's miracle in opening the eyes of one born blind. After his eyes were opened, he was brought before the Sanhedrim, and the judges, we read after his account, "say again to the blind man." Who would argue, because he was still called "blind," that no change had taken place and his eyes were not opened? Again, after our Lord had changed the water into wine, we find it still called water. "When the ruler of the feast had tasted the *water that was made wine*, and knew not whence it was; but the servants which drew the *water* knew." No one, because it was called water after the miracle, doubts but that it became wine. In like manner St. Paul may designate the Sacrament as "This Bread," while at the same time he affirms it to be the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Another most instructive peculiarity in St. Paul's account is, that he implies that the change wrought is due to the act of consecration. If no change was wrought we should expect that it could be made evident by some explanatory words that the elements were symbols or signs only. But not only is it affirmed that what we eat is the Body of Christ, and what we drink is the new covenant in Christ's Blood, but the cause is given. It is not referred to the faith of the receiver. It is not said to be a Presence merely in the heart of the communicant.

St. Paul says: "The Cup of Blessing which we bless," "the bread which we break, is it not the communion (or partaking) of the Blood and the Body of Christ?" (I Cor. x. 16). It is by the act of consecration the change is effected.

But more clearly yet does St. Paul teach the truth of Christ's Real Presence. Occasion arose at Corinth for the Apostle most severely to animadvert on the order of the celebration. Uniting the Agape or Love Feast along with the Sacrament, some had behaved disorderly and been drunken. This profanation of the sacred mystery had been most signally rebuked by a punishment sent directly by Almighty God. A grievous sickness had broken out among them. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you and some sleep," i.e., or had died. This is the interpretation given of sleep by many commentators of the thirtieth verse. It is indeed noticeable that in the New Dispensation as well as in the Old, first transgressions are severely punished. If the two witnesses spoken of in Rev. xi. 3 are the Ministry and Sacraments, we read that if any man wrong them "fire proceedeth out of their mouth." Ananias and Sapphira and Elymas and Simon Magus and these Corinthians sinned against holy persons and holy things and their punishment came.

Now what was the nature of the sin of the unworthy Corinthian communicants? So far as the Agape was concerned, it had been no love feast at all. Persons had brought, as in heathen times to

their temples, their own provisions, and feasted on them apart or shared them with their own social circle to the neglect of others. The element of Christian fellowship, of brotherhood and charity among all, rich and poor, had been wanting. In eating every one had taken before other his own supper, and one was hungry and another drunken. "What!" says the Apostle in scorching rebuke; "have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the Church of God?" Then he turns to the other and far more serious matter, the profanation of the Blessed Sacrament. It was "for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." Let the punishment have been whatever it may have been, there is no question as to the sin they had committed. These are St. Paul's words concerning it. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or condemnation) to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body."

If our Lord's Body was not present, St. Paul might have arraigned them, as he did above, for their want of reverence to the holy symbols. He might have censured them for not respecting the church building, or for their committing an offence against God's condescension. He might have reproved them for their want of apprehension of the death of Christ of which the Sacrament was but a memorial. But no; their sin was of another and

more heinous nature. They had received unworthily because they had "not discerned the Lord's Body," and receiving unworthily, had been "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." It was so grievous an offence, because it was an offence against Christ's own Person. The Body and Blood are stated as the object against which the wrong has been committed. By not discerning the Lord's Body, the unworthy communicant commits, St. Paul says, a personal offence. He is "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." It is a transgression like that in the civil law known as *Lèse Majesté*, a sin against majesty. In this case it is so terrible a degree of that crime in the Apostle's estimation, because it is a personal insult to Christ. This is St. Paul's account of the nature of their sin.

What is the natural inference? If the Lord's Body and Blood were not actually there by the act of consecration, then that special sin could not have been committed. If the elements are simply symbols or signs, with whatever irreverence they might be treated, it could not be called a sin against Christ's Person. Defacing the statue of a King may, in monarchical countries, be a treasonable action, but it is not of like enormity as a personal insult. The Arians tried to arouse the Emperor's anger by pointing to his statue, whose face his enemies had disfigured. Passing his hand quietly over his face, Constantine soberly observed, "I do not feel anything." If the Lord Himself was not really present in the Eucharist and the elements

were but symbols, He could not by the Corinthians have been personally wronged. He was indeed there, but because His Presence was so humbly veiled and hidden, He was not honoured or discerned.

Alas! how often this is so now. Hidden, God is in nature. "Thou art a God that hidest Thyself." Hidden is He in His Providence, that guides us from the cradle to the grave. Hidden was His divine nature behind the garment of His humanity. Hidden is He in His operations of grace in the soul, and hidden is He in the Blessed Sacrament of His Love. We stumble most at the greatness of God's condescensions and the miracles of His loving kindness. Therefore we fail to discover His Presence in the Blessed Sacrament and fail to give Him the honour that is His due. The same punishment indeed does not now ensue as broke out upon the guilty Corinthians. God speaks but once in punishment, that we may see how great the sin is, but He forbears in love that His mercy may win us to repentance.

We conclude then that the language of St. Paul, who is here the organ of the Holy Spirit, tells us that Christ's Body and Blood are really present, not by the act of reception, but by virtue of the Breaking and Blessing, and objectively so present, that the non-recognition with due reverence and faith is a grievous sin against that Body and Blood. O Blessed Jesus, forgive and spare us for our coldness, unbelief, and irreverence! We know not what we

have done. Kindle within us, priests and laymen, a desire to make some worthy reparation for our neglect and that of our Church. May it be by more worshipful and better prepared receptions and by bearing witness by advancing holiness to Thy abiding Presence.

On the golden stairway reaching heavenward, Christ has left the footprints of His piercéd Feet, and life is our one opportunity of doing that for Him which costs us something. What, dear Christian soul, shall it be?

CHAPTER VIII

THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

HAVING considered our Lord's prophetic discourse delivered before His Ascension, on the great gift He was to bestow, and His revelation of it made subsequently to St. Paul, let us now turn to the Institution itself. It is recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, in almost identically the same words. It may be well to have the English texts before us. This is the record in chapter xxvi. 26–28 of St. Matthew:

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; This is My Body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is

My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

In St. Mark xiv. 22–24 we read:

"And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: This is My Body. And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many."

In St. Luke xxii. 19, 20, the record runs thus: "And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is My Body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you."

The accounts in St. Matthew and St. Mark are practically identical. The same may be said of that in St. Luke, but as he gives us some helpful and suggestive additions, we will first consider them. It is not necessary for us to enter into the disputed question whether Christ spoke the words of Institution over the third paschal cup — that of blessing — or not. St. Luke carefully discriminates between the cup of the paschal supper and that of the Sacrament. This is clearly recorded:

"And He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. And

He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come."

This evidently was the cup of the paschal supper.

Our Lord says He will not drink of it. He will not drink till the type be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. He does away with the type and proceeds to its fulfilment. For St. Luke goes on to say that He took the cup *after supper* and pronounced the sacred words over it, saying, "This cup" (in contrast with the other) "is the New Testament or Covenant in My Blood." The former covenant was in the blood of animals. It was animal blood. The new covenant was in His Blood. "And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the Covenant" (Ex. xxiv. 8). "He sprinkled all the people, saying, This is the blood of the Testament" (Heb. ix. 19, 20). The blood, we may observe, of the original paschal lamb, was sprinkled on the lintel and doorposts, and real lambs were slain at every yearly renewal of the great observance. Now Christ, the true Paschal Lamb, says, This is My Blood. My Blood is the Blood of the New Covenant. In both cases, under the old and new covenants, it is real blood. Under the Old Dispensation it could only be put on the houses or sprinkled upon the people. Now they could receive It into themselves.

We do not know in what way the saying in St.

Matthew xxvi. 29 is best harmonized with this fuller account given by St. Luke. In St. Matthew, following the words of Institution, our Lord says: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom." This general statement in St. Matthew may be interpreted by the more full and particular one in St. Luke and so refer, as that in St. Luke, to the paschal supper and its cup. If so, this remark of our Lord has no bearing on the question of the Real Presence.

On the other hand, the difference in language ascribed to our Lord may show that the words do refer to two different things; one being the paschal cup, spoken of as the fruit of the vine, the other to the cup of the Sacrament, spoken of as *This Fruit* of the Vine. Christ had, in His discourse that night to the disciples, declared Himself to be the true and real Vine. "This fruit of the Vine" would consequently signify His own Blood. And in His Father's Kingdom and at the marriage supper of the Lamb, Christ is said, by His mystical body the Church, to feed with His beloved on that that He imparts.

To the Twelve spake Truth eternal,
To the branches spake the Vine:
"Never more from this day forward
Shall I taste again this wine,
Till I drink it in the Kingdom
Of My Father, and with Mine."

While we give both of the above interpretations of the verse in St. Matthew, we do not insist on either. The investigation we are pursuing does not require the acceptance of either exegesis. Our readers must make their own selection. It is possible to take the words in St. Matthew as referring to the consecrated chalice, yet be speaking of it as the fruit of the Vine. We have, however, previously shown that to call the Sacrament bread or wine after the consecration does not imply that it is not Christ's Body and Blood, any more than calling the man whose eyes were opened the blind man proves Christ had not worked a miracle. This disposes of any objection to the Real Presence arising from the saying, I will not drink of this fruit of the Vine.

Let us notice another peculiarity in St. Luke's record. He alone of the Evangelists records the words: "This do in remembrance of Me." St. Paul, from whom he probably learned them, also adds the words of the command given for the continuance of the Sacrament: "For thereby ye do show the Lord's death till He come." It is interesting to observe why these words, "This do," are to be found in the gospel according to St. Luke. While it was the province of St. John in his gospel to set forth especially the Divinity of Christ, and that of St. Mark His Manhood, St. Matthew does the same for the Kingdom and the King, while St. Luke is fuller of the temple and the priesthood and Christ as the victim and the priest. In conform-

ity with this spirit that runs throughout his gospel, St. Luke records Christ's command to the Apostles, "This do in remembrance of Me." For the word which is here rendered "do" is the same word that in the Old Testament in a sacrificial connection is translated "offer." Here we have our Lord as the High Priest after the order of Melchisedec with the mystical oblation of bread and wine. Here we have the breaking of the bread and the separate blessing of the cup, with the sacrificial words, My Body and My Blood. Here, too, is the sacrificial term of Remembrance or Memorial to be made before God. Thus this expression, which is connected with the idea of sacrifice and priest, is most fittingly recorded by St. Luke.

It will probably be helpful to some of our readers to give a further explanation of the word REMEMBRANCE. The word REMEMBRANCE means calling to mind of one's self or another. It had to Jewish ears a liturgical signification. It was associated with the blowing of trumpets over the sacrifices "that they may be to you for a Memorial before your God" (Num. x. 10). It was connected with the incense placed on the Shew Bread (Lev. xxiv. 7) "for a Memorial, an offering made by fire unto the Lord." It was the portion of the meat offering burned on the altar by the priest to bring the offerer into remembrance before God (Lev. vi. 15). "When therefore," says Bishop John Wordsworth, "our Lord said 'Do this for My Memorial,' He spoke words which fell certainly upon no unprepared or inattentive ears.

Those who heard Him knew the sense of the Hebrew intuitively. They knew He did not mean 'Do (or offer) this to remind yourselves of Me,' but 'by this make a solemn commemoration of Me to God.'"

Our own Church puts this interpretation on the words of the Institution and incorporates them into her Communion service. "Wherefore O Lord and Heavenly Father, *according to the Institution* of Thy dearly beloved Son Our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the *Memorial* Thy Son hath commanded us to make." The words "This do" mean, then, to make this as a Memorial of Me before God and also, as was commanded through St. Paul, "Show forth My death till I come."

And now notice the difference in our Lord's language in His discourse to the people, given in the sixth chapter of St. John, and at the time of the Institution. When He was speaking to those who were to be His followers, He commanded them to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. They were to be receivers. Speaking to them in this their character of communicants, He bade them eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. He said nothing to them about their making a Memorial of Him. He did not say to them, "This do." He said nothing to them about their remembering Him in any way. They were addressed as receivers of a gift. That is clearly His teaching.

But when He instituted the Sacrament, it must be observed, no laymen were present. There were no women and no laymen. He never said to any layman, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Save as sharers in the priesthood, and so participating in offering the sacrifice, these words cannot be quoted or claimed by them. No layman can say, in denial of the Real Presence, that our Lord bade us receive in remembrance of Him. In the first place He never uttered such words to any one. What He said to His Apostles, as His representatives, was, "Do this as a Memorial of Me." What He said to all as receivers was, "My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed"; and "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no life in you."

We now come to the words of Institution. Our Lord knew of the struggle in the Apostles' minds when He had announced His doctrine and forced them to accept it or break with Him. Had any mistake been made, now was the time to correct it. If His words then did not necessarily imply His Real Presence in the Eucharist, now was the time to make manifest His true meaning. It would have been such a simple and easy thing to do. Surely He would not have left His Apostles and a greater part of the Church in grievous error, when it could so readily and lovingly have been avoided. But what did He do? In a manner most solemn and significant, after the type of the paschal supper with its religious accompaniments were over, our

Lord, whose every action was instinct with divine meaning, prepares Himself for the celebration. "And supper being ended," or if as some think this be a mistranslation, at some point in it, "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He was come from God, and went to God; He riseth from supper, and laid aside His garments; and took a towel, and girded Himself. After that He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded."

He was hereby gathering the Apostles into union with His own priestly office as He had before united them by commission to His prophetical one, and would after His Resurrection with His kingly. This washing of their feet was part of the ceremony of their ordination, who were to break and bless the bread and offer the Memorial of Christ's Body and Blood. Very solemn and significant are the actions of Christ in laying aside His garments, symbolizing thereby His laying aside the glory He had with the Father before the world was, and the girding Himself with the towel of our human nature by His Incarnation. In most loving manner He washes the disciples' feet, and, symbolizing thereby the means of their inward purification, wipes them with the towel with which He is girded. We must not pause on the great liturgical prayer He uttered, as our great High Priest.

When we come to the Institution itself, the words are without ambiguity, or metaphor, or figure:

"Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take, eat; THIS IS MY BODY. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

What, we may ask, could be more confirmatory of His former teaching, what more clear, what more absolutely affirmative? That which He takes in His hands He declares to be His Body. This, He says of the Cup, is My Blood. He is the Omnipotent God and all things exist by His power and are what the Lord declares them to be. He is the Truth itself and cannot err, neither can He deceive nor be deceived. He declares that which He designates, to be His Body and Blood.

While the vast majority of Churchmen from the earliest times have so held and found in it their greatest comfort and highest joy, there are some in these latter and darker days who have lost faith in Christ's objective Presence. They have not followed the traditions of the Church as Christ bade us to do, saying, "Hear the Church," but have been made the unconscious victims of the traditions of men. They have followed some great man, like Luther or Calvin or Wesley or Channing. They have made him their guide and master, which is what Christ forbade us to do. They have taken for granted the forced and manufactured arguments of those wise in their own wisdom, who have broken

with the wisdom that speaks through the consent of the Church.

But with all love to those who oppose the ancient faith, let us fairly consider their argument. They admit that Christ says "This is My Body," but they reply the word "is" must sometimes be taken as meaning "represents"; so that all Christ meant was, "This represents My Body."

We must, therefore, examine the alleged cases where the word "is" has the sense of "represents," and see if they are parallel to the case of the institution. For we might reply, there are ten thousand more instances where the word "is" has its positive meaning, and why should the few cases it has not govern our interpretation here? It will be at once admitted that it is not sufficient for our friends to find some cases where the word "is" may be taken as synonymous for meaning "represents," but the cases must be parallel to the one we are honestly seeking to interpret. We will make this clearer as we go on.

But first let us look at the cases cited. Here are most of them. "The seven good kine are seven years" (Gen. xii. 26, 27). "The ten horns are ten kingdoms" (Dan. vii. 24). "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the Kingdom; the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy is the devil; the reapers are the angels" (St. Matt. xiii. 38–39). "The Rock was Christ" (I Cor. v. 4). "For these are the two covenants" (Gal. iv. 24).

Now in these instances it is granted the word "is" may be taken to mean "represents." But then none of these cases are similar to that of the words of Institution, and so in no way affects its interpretation. They are all, as a child may see, explanations of visions, or an allegory, or a parable.

In Genesis the king has a vision of seven lean cattle and seven fat cattle. Joseph interprets the vision picture and says the seven good kine are seven years. The beast seen in the vision picture in Daniel has ten horns, and the explanation is, that the ten horns are ten kingdoms. In St. Matthew our Lord gives us some word pictures or parables, and then points out what the things in them stand for, i.e., the field is the world, the reapers are the angels. St. Paul declares that he is relating an allegory, and when he says the Rock was Christ, he is careful to explain that it was a spiritual rock whereof he spoke.

Now the difference between explaining an allegory, or vision, or parable and the case in hand is obvious. If any one, for example, should point to a picture and say that is George Washington, it would be perfectly well understood that the speaker meant that it was a portrait of him. So when any word picture, by way of allegory, or parable, or vision is explained, the word "is" in the explanation means "represents." The field in the parable is or represents the world. But except in these cases of parable, vision, or allegory, the word "is" has its ordinary signification, and connects the subject

and predicate together by way of identity. It was on that solemn night that the Apostles said, "Now Thou speakest plainly and speakest no parable"; so when our Lord said, This is My Body, the phrase must be taken in its literal signification and must mean it is His Body.

Again, some have tried to explain away the plain meaning of our Lord's words by quoting such texts as these: "I am the Door," "I am the Vine." But these are not parallel constructions. Nor does the verb in either case signify "represent." Our Lord is not saying that He represents the Door or the Vine; nor that He is like a Door. Nor is He pointing to any particular door or vine, and saying, "It is I." But He is saying that He Himself, in His Humanity, is the Way or the Door. He is the Door through which we must pass by partaking of that humanity. As it is written, "He has opened a new and living way through the veil, that is, His Flesh." Again He is saying, not that He represents a vine, or that a vine is like Himself, but that He is indeed the True Vine, and with His Humanity we must be united, that the life-giving sap of His Divine Nature may flow into us.

So also the very foolish attempt to parallel our Lord's words in the Institution by the phrase, "This is the Lord's passover," has ceased to deceive any one. In the phrase, "This is the Lord's passover," the word "passover" may here mean the feast or day, as when we say, This is Easter, or it may, by a common Jewish usage of speech, mean the paschal

lamb. In either case the word does not mean "represent." We are, therefore, now obliged, — all these futile objections the product of old controversy being swept away, — to rest on the plain, literal meaning of Christ's words. He said, This is My Body and My Blood; and what He said must be true.

Before leaving the Institution, let us point to one further confirmatory argument. Our Lord did not, in the words used by Himself, compare together or contrast two things. He did not name the two things of Bread and Wine. He carefully avoided this construction. He did not say this Bread is My Body, this Wine is My Blood. If He had done so, it had then been open to argument that the word "is" might have had a representative signification. But our Lord did not do this. He took bread and the cup into His Hands and said, referring to that He so held and the cup contained, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood of the New Testament." In other words, *our Lord simply named that to which He referred.* The Greek, by the use of the neuter pronoun, makes this clear. He named each in turn, saying, This is My Body, this is My Blood. Now when Almighty God names anything, it is different from a man's doing so. All that we men can do when we name things is to classify them. We paste a label on them. We put them into a class. But when Almighty God names anything, it becomes what He names it. His word does not classify nor put things into a category, but it makes them what they are. So when He said,

"This is My Body" and "This is My Blood," they became what His words declared them to be. The first test of man's obedience was given in the simple command, "Eat not." To eat was to die. He was to obey, though his reason could not fathom the mystery. The test of obedience to-day is given in the command to "Eat"; though the mystery be great, let us believe and eat and live.

We must here leave the matter with our readers, asking for them the Spirit's guidance, and for ourselves their prayers. The chains of prejudice are hard to break. Our inherited traditions hold us, as the Jews, in their iron grasp. The old are most unwilling to receive new truths. Few have the courage to achieve the freedom of faith. The spirit of the age is impatient of aught that requires acceptance of the supernatural. The fear of a dreaded Romanism warps the understanding. Party spirit is seemingly stronger with many than the Holy Spirit. The name of an advocate, however humble, is allowed to prejudice Christ's cause. Yet how can we brother Churchmen defend ourselves against the Unitarian if we reject the literal meaning of Christ's words? Christ says, This is My Body, and we explain it away, saying it only means, This represents My Body. We turn to the Unitarian and quote to him the text, "The Word was God." And on our own lines of argument he replies, That does not mean that the Word was actually God and one with Him, but only that He represents Him. Consistency adds its strength to the argu-

ment for accepting the literal meaning of our Lord's words.

It is not only for the honour of our dear Lord we write, nor merely that His great act of love should be recognized. Our Church is just now under the lash of partisans like a troubled sea. The peril is that good men of all sides do not understand and trust each other. If a wider acceptance of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist could obtain among us, the waves of this controversial sea would subside in obedience to Christ's word of Peace. The disputes over Ritual would dwindle into small and manageable quantities. Not that one party would triumph over another, but all would be willing that our Lord's Presence should be honoured by a reverent ritual, while but very few would desire an excess which would take from the honour due Him by an attention attracted to itself.

If this great central truth of Christ's Presence were more widely and practically accepted, it would be the rallying point of the devout and earnest minded. Christ with us could unite us. The differences which seem like widening gaps between us would be considered of less importance in contrast with the great vital bond of faith in the Eucharist which would bind us together.

If the belief that our Lord is really present filled our hearts, how would not our churches be full again with devoted worshippers! Can we overestimate, either, the development of the spiritual life that would ensue? For as of old the prophet

stretched himself on the body of the dead child, and put his hands on the child's hands and his feet on the child's feet, so does our Blessed Lord come in contact with our bodies, souls, and spirits. The virtues in Him as we open our minds and hearts by faith and love, pass into us. We are no longer striving to copy Him, but He is in us, extending the virtues of His own life. The meekness, humility, unselfishness, faith, fortitude, zeal of Christ, is extended into the lives of those who believe in His Presence in the Sacrament, and make room for Him in their hearts.

"O Jesu, pierced for love of me,
How can this poor heart grateful be?
Would that my burning heart might be
Even as is Thy love to me.

"I cannot love Thee as I would
Yet pardon me, O highest Good;
My life and all I call mine own
I lay before Thine Altar-throne."

THE HOLY COMMUNION

A BRIEF EXPOSITION CIRCULATED AS A POPULAR TRACT

THE Holy Communion is a wonderful subject. It is a wonder in itself. Let the writer, desirous of helping his fellows respectively, address himself to three classes:

1. TO MY FELLOW-MAN.
2. TO MY FELLOW-CHRISTIAN.
3. TO MY FELLOW-CHURCHMAN.

I. My Fellow-man.

The man I am thinking of is a practical, well-instructed business man. He is a real person, and a friend of mine, and I like him very much. I meet him often at the club; he is an excellent companion, and has all the good qualities of a gentleman. He does not go to Church, unless at Easter, with his wife. He has not felt the need of any religion, and sees no reason why he should join any Church. There seems to be no common ground on which we may approach each other. If a man does not believe there is a God, immanent in nature, yet transcending it, how can we talk to him about revelation?

But we must try. We begin with this proposition. Something must have been eternal. If at one time there was nothing in existence, out of nothing, nothing could come. The fact that something is, proves that something has been eternal.

Even if it is matter and force, there is a directing energy behind nature which, by its orderly progress, shows itself to be an intelligent one. This Energy is known by us as God. If this were not so, the Universe would be a nightmare; and if the Intelligent Energy did not reveal Himself to human intelligence, the Universe would be an immoral one.

My friend admitted this was probably true, but said, "Where are you to find this revelation?" It is to be found, I said, in the material world, in its order and beauty, in the conscience of man with his sense of right and wrong, in gifted persons like poets and philosophers, in all times and nations, in a progressive revelation through prophets and teachers, which revelation has culminated in Christ.

"Your theory," my friend said, "involves the belief that Almighty God came to this little planet. Now does not modern science, which reveals to us the enormous size of the Universe, prove a serious obstacle to this belief? Emerson pointed this out, and thought it was a fatal objection to the Christian theory. Why should God have come to so insignificant a planet as this earth?" The answer is,—the Universe, magnificent as it is, is one whole thing. It is governed by universal laws, and is a unit in itself. The immensity of its size, and the billions of years in its formation, were the preparations for God's coming, and gave dignity to the event. Entering into the Universe, and for the benefit of the whole of it, He must enter it at some one point, and the point He selected was our planet, and the

nature of man. He thus united the creation He had made, by a new union with Himself. The littleness of the bridal chamber is no argument against the union.

Again, Christ's life proves at least His sincerity and trustworthiness; and He claimed, as no other teacher ever claimed, to have had a pre-existence, and to have come from Heaven to be our Guide. He said, "Before Abraham was, I am." "What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" "I am the Living Bread, which came down from Heaven." "If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live forever." "And the bread which I shall give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World." I will now confine myself to what He said about the Holy Communion.

It is in the Synoptics as well as in St. John's Gospel that He declares this truth; and instituting the Sacrament said of the Bread that He broke and blest, "This is my Body," and of the Cup, "This is the new Covenant in my Blood." He did not say this represents my Body, but this is my Body.

Grant it is a mystery; but if we trust Him at all, we must believe what He said to be true. There was also a great reason for it. Now if you believe, my fellow-man, in the evolutionary progress of creation, as I do, you will not be unwilling to believe that the progress has not stopped with man, as he is. The Church's teaching is that man is to be developed and elevated into a higher sphere, by becoming sinless and perfect through a new union with God. This secures

to us a state of eternally progressive bliss. This is called the "Gift of Eternal Life," and is something different from Immortality. This gift Christ offers us through union with His own nature; and an especial instrument of that union is the Holy Communion. We are thereby incorporated into Christ now, and eventually may attain to a new union with God in bliss and glory.

Christ thus makes a great offer to you, and the question is, will you take it? Or will you be so foolish as some and say, "God made me, He must take care of me. God is merciful, I will trust myself to the mercy of God." Now God has extended His mercy to us through the Holy Eucharist, and said, "Do this, in remembrance of Me." We put to you, dear friend, the common-sense question, "Can you reject the mercy of God so lovingly offered, and at the hour of death claim it? And if, rejecting Christ's offer, you lose the gift of Eternal Life, and thus are lost, as you surely will be, ask yourself seriously the question, "whose fault will it be?"

II. My Dear Fellow-Christian.

You have been baptized, I believe, in the Name of the Holy Trinity. All baptized persons we churchmen regard as fellow-Christians. You have, we believe, a Holy Communion service once in three months, which you keep as a Memorial of the death of Christ. It is no doubt a very precious and helpful service to you. The broken bread and the outpoured wine bring before the mind the broken Body

and the outpoured Blood of Christ. It is a most blessed and spiritual Memorial. It is a living witness of the death of Christ and our acceptance through His merits, and His Precious Blood. All that you say of its benefits to yourself, we can well understand. But did not Christ leave something more than a Memorial of His Death and Passion? Did He not leave the gift of His very Self?

Have you ever thought in this connection of what the testimony of the whole church is and has been? In considering any religious question, is it not wise to take into account the experience of our fellow-Christians? Is it not true that our religion does not consist in believing certain doctrines, but in union with a divine Person? Has it not also the same foundation as scientific truth, viz.: hypothesis or theory demonstrated by experiment? Now the Divine Master said, "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." "Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day, for my Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed." "He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood dwelleth in me, and I in him." What then we ask is the testimony of Christian experience?

Now the larger portion of the Christian Church has taken the words of Christ literally and declared that their experience has found this interpretation to be true. The ancient Church, as testified by the witness of the Fathers, shows that it believed in the

Real Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist by virtue of the consecration of the elements. To-day, the Eastern Churches with one hundred million communicants and the Roman Church with twice as many more, and the Anglican Church with its many thousands, believe in the Real Objective Presence of Christ. They testify to it by their devotional writings, and consecrated lives. They declare that they know they have received Jesus Christ's Body and Blood, and have been partakers of His Soul and Divinity. Wherever in the Church there is an ordained priesthood, this is the universal testimony. Is it not a wonderful testimony? Is it not worth considering? Put it to yourself in this wise. Do not you or your ministers, in arguing with inquirers, tell them of the experience of all Christians? Do they not tell the doubting inquirer how seekers have trusted Christ's words and believed in Him, and then found peace? Why should not you therefore in like manner accept the experience of those who receive the Sacrament in a Church where the Priesthood has been preserved, and declare they receive something more than you do, in your sectarian denomination? Surely you as a Christian need all that Christ has left you for your soul's good, and if in our Church there is something more than you have yet received, why should you not come to your dear Lord and get it?

Perhaps you may have some such objection as this. "How can Jesus Christ, Who is in Heaven, at the same time be on so many thousands of Altars as a belief in the Real Presence implies?" The

answer is, He does not have to move or come down. He remains where He is at the right Hand of Power. But the union of His Manhood with His Divine Nature enables His Manhood to be manifested within His Spiritual Body, which is the Church, wherever and whenever He will. He gave us a proof of this in His appearance to Saul on the roadway to Damascus. He had ascended to Heaven, where Stephen in a vision saw Him, but without moving locally, He nevertheless appeared to Saul and communed with him. We must grant that it is a mystery, but He has given us a proof of how it might be, and we accept it on His sure word.

You very rightly as a Christian ask, "Where did our Lord ever say what you Episcopalians or Catholics hold?" In S. John's Gospel, He gave, in the sixth chapter, a full instruction on the subject of the Holy Eucharist. Like some other discourses of of His, it was divided into two parts, and if you would rightly understand this discourse, you must notice the two divisions in it. The first part begins with verse 35, and ends with verse 47. The second part begins at verse 48, and continues to the end. Each of these sections commences with the same heading or proposition, viz.: "I am the Bread of Life." In each part, there is a special donor, a special gift, and a special duty and blessing resulting from it. In the first part of the discourse, the donor is the Eternal Father, the gift the Father bestoweth is Jesus Christ, and the duty of receiving the gift is believing in Jesus Christ. Now in the second part

of this discourse all this is changed. Christ begins as before by saying I am the Bread of Life. But now He is the Giver and Donor. He says, "The Bread that I will give is my Flesh." The gift He states to be His Flesh, "For my Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed." The duty is not that of believing merely, but eating. "He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood dwelleth in Me and I in him." The benefit we receive therefrom is the gift of Life as He said, "He that eateth Me shall live by Me," and "As your Fathers did eat manna and are dead, he that eateth of this Bread shall live forever."

While in the first part of the discourse, the duty inculcated is that of believing in Him, the duty inculcated in the second part is to partake of His Body and Blood. This is His real meaning, as seen by the objections made to it at the time. Not realizing His Divinity, some of His hearers said, "How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?" They did not understand that our Lord was not, like themselves, a common man. Our Lord therefore pointed out to them the fact of His Supernatural Being. He had come down from Heaven, and, "What, if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" By this explanation Christ sought to help them. By the union with His Divine nature, our Lord's humanity had a quickening or life-giving power, so S. Paul tells us. Our Lord, as the second Adam, was made a quickening or life-giving Spirit. This our Lord declared, saying, "The words that I speak

unto you," i.e. the things I have been telling you about, viz. my Body and my Blood, "they are spirit, and they are life." In this way, our Lord explains in part the great Mystery. By virtue of its union with His divine nature His human nature had a life-giving power.

Clearly, if He meant His hearers were simply to believe on Him, and receive the Communion merely as a Memorial, He would not have let them misunderstand Him, and go away.

This teaching of our Lord concerning the Holy Communion is emphatically brought out at the Institution of the Sacrament. He then,— after the symbolical action of laying aside His garment, the figure of His putting off His Glory, and girding Himself with a towel, the type of His taking upon Himself our human nature, and wiping the disciples' feet with the towel wherewith He was girded, a token of our cleansing, — took bread into His holy Hands, and breaking it, He said, "This is my Body, and this Cup is the new Covenant in my Blood." He then, by His Almighty power, the same that had changed the water into wine, identified that which He held in His hand with Himself, and it came to be by His word what He declared it to be, His Body and His Blood. As loving disciples of Him, and as little children, should we not accept it?

It is the glory of the Anglican Church that she has preserved intact this great and solemn truth, and can bestow this precious making gift on her people. Why, we ask again, should you not have it?

There is, in conclusion, a loving question we would ask. You believe in Christ, and hope to enter Heaven, have you ever asked yourself the question, what, if you attain that blest condition, will keep you there? Only by holiness can one see the Lord, and only by sinlessness can one remain in the Heavenly state. Now, we know the Angels by sinning fell from Heaven. What is to keep you from doing so? Any one sin would cast a person out from Heaven as it did the Angels. What security have you that you will not fall into some spiritual one, and so lose your estate? It is true you cannot there be tempted by the world, the flesh, or Satan, but you have got your own self, just as the Angels had, and any sin involving self would immediately forfeit your estate, and you would be cast out as the bad Angels were. Think over the matter. What is it that will keep you in a sinless condition, and so secure for you Heaven as a permanent estate? The Church has her answer. It is through a special union with God, begun here by a sacramental union with the humanity of Christ. Only in and through that humanity can we attain Heaven, and only by union with His humanity can we be maintained in it. Your theology does not answer this problem. It does not give a satisfactory reason why the Son of God should continue forever to wear our nature. Had He taken it simply for the work of our redemption, then when that work was accomplished, the Divine economy would have laid it aside. But He wears it now and will wear it eternally. He does

this in order that we being united with it, may be sustained there in a sinless condition and remain in Heaven forever. If, therefore, you desire a security of that eternal happiness, begin now by receiving the Body and Blood of your Lord which will prepare you for the final union with Him in glory.

III. To My Fellow-Churchman.

Do you realize that the Holy Communion is a sacrifice? I think I can hear you say that you thought all sacrifices were done away. No, this is a mistake. The offering of sacrifice is a necessary part of all religious worship. There cannot be a complete religious worship without it. This is so, because by sacrifice our relation to God is acknowledged, and by means of His reciprocal action a Gift and Blessing are vouchsafed to us.

It is the law of reciprocity, or exchange, that runs throughout nature. Nothing lives to itself alone. Everything lives by a process of giving and receiving. By sacrifice, we give something ordained by God, to Him, and He gives something in return to us. Thus sacrifice, as expressive of man's relation to God, and of God's gift to us, is to be found in every dispensation.

In Eden, man offered to God, by abstaining from it, the tree of Knowledge, a thing symbolical of His own innocence, and God gave to him the privilege of partaking of the Tree of Life.

In man's fallen condition and under the law, man offered animal sacrifices, an acknowledgment by

man that he was under the law of death. God gave to him in return, temporal blessings and the promise of a future Redeemer. In the Gospel dispensation, we, being in a state of grace, offer the Memorial Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and God gives us back the privilege of feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls. Thus there is a sacrifice in every dispensation.

But you say again: I thought Christ had made one Sacrifice, and there could be no other, for it is written in Hebrews x. 12, "This Man, after He had made one Sacrifice for sin for ever, sat down on the right Hand of God." Moreover, it is written, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins," how then can there be this Memorial Sacrifice? To understand this, you must make a distinction between the Sacrifice Christ offered on Calvary for human nature, or all mankind, and the memorial pleading of it. You can understand this distinction by considering the day of the Jewish Atonement. In the Old Dispensation, there was a daily sacrificial offering of a lamb. But on the day of Atonement all the daily sacrificial offerings ceased. Ere they could be resumed, the High Priest had to make a special Atonement for the nation, as a nation. When the nation had been reconciled to God, then the daily sacrifices could be resumed.

This explains the offering on Calvary. He made there the one, All-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. It could not be repeated or added to.

But He gave to His Church the power of offering a daily Memorial of that Sacrifice, when He said to His Apostles, "Do this," or "offer this, as a Memorial of Me." Thus the sacrifice on Calvary, like the Jewish day of the Atonement, did not take away Sacrifice from the Church's service, but established the use of it.

Two things follow from this. If you want to partake of the benefit of Christ's Atoning Sacrifice, you must not only believe in it, but plead it in the way He has ordained, and by becoming a faithful communicant, be identified with it.

Again: if you would rightly fulfil your religious duty on the Lord's Day, you will not only be present at Morning Prayer, but at the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. There, bring your petitions, and lay them on Christ's Altar, yea, on His very Self, and He in His great love will plead His Merits on your behalf, and make your petitions His own.

Do you realize the difference between your communion and that of sectarians? You know that by the Priest's consecration the elements become the Body and Blood of Christ. Sectarians, having no Priesthood, are lacking in this power. We do not know how the change takes place, but accept it as a mystery, on Christ's word, believing it makes a great difference to our Christian life and character.

We are not merely looking, as sectarians do, to Christ as an Example, and so are trying to pattern our lives after His, but He in the Eucharist communicates not only His Body and Blood to us,

but His Soul with all its virtues, making us also a partaker, as the Apostle Paul tells us, of His Divine Nature.

You will thus find it helpful to say at your communion: "Meekness of Christ, make me meek"; "Patience of Christ, make me patient"; "Zeal of Christ, make me zealous"; "Fortitude of Christ, make me persevering"; "Prayerfulness of Christ, make me prayerful"; "Love of Christ, fill me with Thy Love." Thus Christ's nature and virtues take possession of you and you become Christlike. You are saved by Him, and you are remade in Him; Christ in you is the hope of glory. Seek this union more and more. The more united we are to Him by self-sacrifices, and by works of love and devotion, the more fully shall we enter hereafter into His life of joy and bliss.

And now a word about the worship of the Church. Perhaps you do not like much ceremonial or ritual, as you call it. You do not like to see a Cross on the Altar, or lights, or flowers, or the Priest in Eucharistic vestments. Perhaps you think these things are Romish, or tend that way, and so are opposed to them. If they were introduced as an imitation of Rome, I should be in agreement with you. I believe they came down to us from very early times, and are part of our Catholic heritage. They bear witness to the continuity of our Church, and are a protest against Roman claims. They teach more effectively than words the saving doctrine of Christ's presence with His people. They teach people how to worship

God, the beautiful and good God in "the beauty of Holiness."

It is but natural that churchmen should ask, "Where do you find this ceremonial worship in the Gospel?" "Look," they say, "at Christ. He wore no Eucharistic vestments, He established no glorious worship; He went about in ordinary dress, preaching on the hill-side, or from the pulpit of the rocking boat." We might say in reply, that God had given explicit directions in the Old Dispensation how He would be worshiped; He had ordained a temple service where the Priests wore their glorious vestments; where the service was symbolical, ceremonial, and choral. And in this service so majestically beautiful, Christ took part. He thus sanctioned it by His own Example. And if we had nothing further, this would be a sufficient authorization for the worship of the Christian Church. But we have something more. God, Who changeth not, acted in the New Dispensation as He did in the Old. In the old times after He had led His chosen people out from Egypt, He took Moses up into the Mount, showed him the Heavenly worship. He bade him establish the service of the Tabernacle after the pattern of the things he had then seen. Hence arose that majestical, ceremonial, and symbolical worship, glorious with incense and lights and vestments and song. In like manner, when His followers had been delivered from Judaism, and the Christian Church had been founded at Pentecost, Christ took S. John up into Heaven and showed him the

heavenly worship. He saw there the glorious throne and the Seven Lamps burning before it; saw the Angel with his censer; beheld our Lord in His glorious vestments; heard the Angelic voices and the choirs of the Saints, as they chanted their Trisagion, and "All Holy" hymn. In Heaven, we must believe, they worship God in spirit and in truth, and this vision of the heavenly worship became the directory for the Christian Church. We must now lay old party feelings aside. For now there is a great call of the Spirit to union among all Christians, and the first and most important work is greater union among ourselves. We must trust one another more, and come to a better understanding; and be more tolerant of each other's differences; and work and legislate together and grow in Divine Love towards each other. If all fellow-Churchmen would thus come together, the Church would become a greater power for good in our nation. Our own sanctity would be greatly developed, and the cause of Christian unity would be greatly advanced. May the love of Jesus conquer all self-love in us and all party spirit and unite us in His love.

III

CATHOLICITY AND THE VINCENTIAN RULE

PREFACE

THIS little treatise begins with giving an application of the Rule of St. Vincent to some theological questions concerning faith and practice. St. Vincent's name is a household one in our Communion, especially since the Reformation. He was often quoted by the Reformers and Anglican divines in their controversy with Rome. In his disputation at Oxford, Ridley said, when doubts arose in the Church, "I use the wise counsel of Vincentius Lirinensis, whom I am sure you will allow; who, giving precepts how the Catholic Church may be, in all schisms and heresies, known, writeth on this manner: 'When,' saith he, 'one part is corrupted with heresies then prefer the whole world before the one part: but if the greatest part be infected then prefer antiquity.'"

On the southern coast of France, there is an island called St. Honorat. It had in Vincent's time the name of Lerins. A quite famous monastery flourished there. Under the discipline of its holy religious

rule and the Church's sacramental system, St. Vincent's mind and character were developed.

It was about the year 434 that his short treatise appeared. The controversies which had been raging in the Church led him to put forth his little book as a practical guide for a Churchman in times of trouble. He must, through Divine assistance, fortify his faith in a two-fold manner: by authority of the Divine Law, and by the tradition of the Church. "Catholics," he said, "and true sons of the Church will make it their special care to interpret the Divine Canon by the tradition of the universal Church and according to the rules of Catholic theology. Wherein it is also necessary to follow the universality, antiquity, and consent of the Catholic and Apostolic Church."

This rule, which was so applauded by our Reformers as a guide for Catholics, is sometimes misunderstood and misapplied. It is sometimes taken as if it so commended private judgment as to make the individual an independent judge of what is true. Vincent sought to help those who were Catholics, and who believed in the Church as the organ through which Christ and the Holy Spirit spoke, to know what the Church had said. If there were seemingly conflicting voices, then by an appeal to universality, antiquity, and consent, to discern which was the authoritative and true one.

Whether he was always in the application of his rule, in all details, logically consistent with himself, is no detriment to the value of his general principle.

Our treatise is not an exposition of his commonitory, but a use of his recognized principle in reference to some matters of faith and practice.

As we have stated in the text, the Vincentian rule is an aid for those within the Body of Christ. It does not tell us how to reach those without. The appeal in that blessed work must be first to the needs of man. The better desires and aspirations of his nature must be appealed to. He must be brought to realize his own weakness and sins and the need of an aid other than his own. He must be led to see that it is not by reason alone that anything of a concrete nature is properly understood or known. He that seeks to walk by reason alone in such matters is like a man trying to walk on one leg. Our inherent desires, affections, conscience, moral nature have all a part in the composite act of belief. It is so in all matters save abstract science. It is the whole man that knows. If man's whole nature is trusted and exercised he can then see that Christianity presents the most satisfactory and most rational solution concerning man, his needs and his destiny.

And then, if accepting the Church's teaching, he enters within her portals and lives the life she teaches and uses her Sacraments, he will find the once probable hypothesis demonstrated by a witness within himself. He will come to know God and Christ with whom he is united, and in whom he lives as a child of God.

CHAPTER I

CATHOLICITY AND THE VINCENTIAN RULE

IN determining what is Catholic doctrine and practice, two principles in the application of the famous rule, "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*," must ever be kept in mind.

The first is that the appeal made by the Church to "universality, antiquity, and consent," as made by the Church to her own children (we do not here consider how she reaches those without), is in *confirmation* of her teaching. The word to be remembered is "*confirmation.*" Let us consider this proposition.

We all know that Jesus Christ is the sum and substance and completion of God's revelation to man. He dwells in His Church as the Sun in the heavens dwells in the centre of our planetary system. The Holy Ghost fills the Church as its atmosphere, and so is the instrumentality by which Christ's Life and Light are brought effectively to us. The Church is thus a spiritual organism in which the Light and Life of the Incarnate God are communicated to its members. It communicates these gifts to those who, being brought by Baptism within the sphere of the divine illumination, are thus made capable of receiving them in their fulness and power. The children of the Church thus listen to the Voice that resounds throughout the Church, and they believe what it

says, because it is the Voice of God. Although outward communion between the several parts of the Church has been interrupted, the Catholic Church is yet one by a union which cannot be broken; and so in what the Eastern and Western divisions practically agree, as stated in their creeds and liturgies, that is to be accepted by the Church's devout and humble-minded children as the Catholic Faith.

As showing her faithfulness to her trust and in corroboration of her teaching, the Church points her children to three corroborative witnesses, viz., Holy Scripture, Church History, and Christian Experience.

Bearing in mind the difference between cumulative and corroborative testimony, and proof properly so-called by way of demonstration, we see the difference between the way a Catholic and a Protestant treats these witnesses.

The Church, for instance, throughout the world, teaches her children to believe in the Blessed Trinity, in the Episcopal government of the Church, in the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. She tells those children of hers who are living within the sphere of her divine illumination, and who by use of all the Sacraments are making it their own, that if under her guidance they will read the Holy Scriptures, they will find that the Scriptures will *bear such an interpretation* as will be in *conformity* with her teaching, and so corroborate it. On the other hand, rejecting the Church's

teaching, the Protestant starts in the other way, and says that every proposed doctrine must be proved, i.e., *demonstrated*, by Holy Writ. You must, for example, show not only that the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity is a reasonable interpretation, but that no other interpretation — for instance Sabellianism — is possible to be maintained on scriptural grounds. You must show not only that there is a great deal in favour of Christ's absolute Deity, but you must prove that Scripture is capable of no other interpretation, like high Arianism. You must show explicitly from Holy Scripture that the chief government of the Church was placed in an order of local Bishops, apostolically established, and endowed with the sole power of ordination, and that this office did not develop later out of that of an elder presiding over his brother presbyters. If you cannot prove out of Holy Scripture that the latter was not the case, the Protestant says, I reject Episcopacy.

So, too, in the appeal to Church history. The non-Catholic mind says, You must prove your Church doctrine by the Vincentian Rule, as he understands it. It must have been explicitly stated from the earliest times, must be proved to have been proclaimed everywhere throughout the Church's world, and must have been universally accepted. As there have been schisms and heresies in the Church from the time of Peter and Paul, a Protestant, under a strict application of such a rule, might deny almost any accepted doctrine of the living

Church. The Unitarian makes the same appeal to the fathers of the first three centuries to prove Christ was not consubstantial with God the Father, that other Protestants do against the commonly believed doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church of to-day.

The fallacy of the position lies in this. It is a perfectly sound proposition that if you can show that any doctrine has been explicitly stated from the beginning, has been everywhere promulgated and universally received, it must be true; but it does not follow that because a doctrine cannot be so demonstrated it must be false.

Mother Church appeals to history just as she does to her Holy Scriptures, not to demonstrate, but to *corroborate* her teaching. In doing this, she bids us observe that the remains of writings of the earliest or sub-apostolic age are very scanty. Also, that later, as Professor Salmon remarks, Church history passes through a tunnel. It is light at one end and at the other, but obscure in the middle. Again, on some other matters, less testimony can be found than others, because they were matters of common acceptance, or not brought by heretical attacks into the field of controversy. Moreover, before the Church had guarded her doctrine by conciliar definitions, loose language might be found used by orthodox fathers. It is therefore an easy matter for those who reject the Church's teaching on any point or doctrine to say it cannot be proved by the earliest age, or by the ante-Nicene

fathers. If you cannot prove, positively and negatively, by a number of explicit dogmatic statements that such was the form and no other in which a given doctrine was held, then the Protestant rejects it. He then triumphantly says you have not got the "*Quod Semper*" on your side. But the Church does not expect her children will demand that kind of proof. It is unreasonable. When proper allowances, such as we have above noted, are made for antiquity, the teaching of antiquity will be found to be in agreement with that of the Catholic Church as the Holy Spirit speaks through her to-day.

Consider in this light the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist by virtue of the act of consecration. It is declared by the whole Church, East and West, Russian, Greek, Roman, and Anglican, in their respective Liturgies. The outward and inward parts of the Sacrament are connected by the consecrating act. One proof of this is the different way our Church bids us treat the remaining unconsecrated bread and that which has been consecrated. The unconsecrated, the English rubric says, the curate may have to his own use. But the consecrated must be in church with reverence consumed. It were akin to idolatry to show It any reverence after the communion is done unless the Inward and Outward parts were still connected.

In the Anglican Catechism, the unseen, inward part of the Sacrament is stated to be the Body and Blood of Christ. In her Articles she says that

Christ is not only "received" by the faithful, but "*given* and taken" in the Sacrament. In order to be "given" as the inward part of the Sacrament, Christ must be present in the Sacrament to be so given. But however defined, the whole Catholic Church to-day agrees in teaching the fact of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist as effected by the priest's consecration and the power of the Holy Ghost. And what the Church so teaches, Holy Scripture and antiquity confirm.

We cannot here dwell on the testimony of Holy Scripture, but would refer our readers to our tract, *The Holy Eucharist in the New Testament.*

Concerning Antiquity, "the doctrine of the Real Presence," wrote Dr. Pusey (see his sermon "This is My Body"), "all who know so little of the ancient fathers and Councils know it to have been taught from the first." "Minds the most simple or the most philosophical, the female martyrs of Persia or the philosophic fathers; minds wholly practical as Tertullian or St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian, St. Pacian, St. Julius, or those boldly imaginative, as Origen; poetic minds, as St. Ephrem or St. Isaac or St. Paulinus; fathers who most use a figurative interpretation of the Old Testament as St. Ambrose, or such as, like St. Chrysostom, confined themselves most scrupulously to the letter; mystical writers, as St. Macarius; ascetics as Mark the Hermit or the Abbot Esaias; writers opposed to each other; the friends of Origen, as St. Didymus, or his opponents, as Theophilus of

Alexandria; or again, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret; heretics even, as the Arian Eusebius, or the defenders of the faith as St. Athanasius; Apollinarius or St. Chrysostom, who wrote against him; Nestorius, or St. Cyril of Alexandria — all agree with one consentient explanation of our Lord's words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood."

"Taking Bread," says St. Ireneus, "of this creation, He confessed that it was His Own Body and He affirmed that the mingled drink of the Cup was His Own Blood." "The hand," says St. Cyprian, "receives the Lord's Body." "The Word," says St. Athanasius, "descends into that Bread and that Cup and it becomes His Body." "Thy living Body and Thine atoning Blood," St. Ephrem, "which I have received from the hands of the priests — through these, O Lord, may I be forgiven." "Eat, drink, having Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Saviour in thy hands" (Inscription at Autun, beginning of third century). "The bread of the Eucharist," says St. Cyril, "after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is mere bread no longer, but the Body of Christ." "The bread is up to a certain time common bread," St. Gregory of Nyssa, "but when the mystery shall consecrate it, it is called and becomes the Body of Christ." "It is not man," St. Chrysostom, "who maketh what hath then to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us." "The bread which ye see on the altar," says St. Augustine,

"sanctified by the Word of God is the Body of Christ. That Cup, rather what the Cup holds, sanctified by the Word of God is the Blood of Christ." "The Spirit, on the Mystic Table," declares St. Isidore, "rendereth the common bread to be the proper Body of the Incarnation of our God and Saviour." This doctrine of the Real Presence was attested by canons of the ancient Councils. Deacons who had no power to offer were not to give to those who offer "the Body of Christ."

In like manner we may consider the subject of Eucharistic Adoration. It was a practice based upon the doctrine of the Real Presence. The modes by which this act shows itself have been regulated by the Church. The laity were not to remain in their seats. The Blessed Sacrament was not to be passed around as if it were a mere commemoration. The laity were to draw nigh unto the altar. They were to receive kneeling and in a position of worship. They were taught also to make acts of adoration. The object of their adoration was not the elements but Jesus Christ. No one worships the elements. But as when visible the acts of adoration made in the presence and directed to His Humanity had for their terminus His Divine Person, so the acts of homage before His veiled sacramental Presence are offered to Him. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and Theodoret are witnesses of this fact. They declare it, not as if it was their opinion only, but give it as the common

teaching and usage of the Church. A Protestant might say only a few fathers were thus cited, and not one of them of the second and third centuries. But as they bear witness to the custom of the Church and the inherited belief of early times, the Catholic sees that the Voice of God directing the Church to-day has confirmation in the teaching and practice of the past. Whether we consider Christ as being on earth and so with us, or He, being in heaven and we with Him, He is present in His Spiritual Body, the Church, and sacramentally manifests Himself to us as an Object of Love and worship in the Blessed Sacrament.

The second grave error, often made, in the test of Catholicity, is to apply the Vincentian Rule to *practices*. It was not so applied by St. Vincent himself, as seen in the twenty-eighth chapter of his first volume. The reason the Vincentian Rule does not apply to practice is this: The Church is a living Body. She has a corporate life. As the Bride of Christ, she repeats in her life the different phases of her Lord's Life. She has her hidden life, her missionary and public life, her disunited, rent, and crucified life when all her bones are out of joint. She has her glorified life. She is drawn consequently in special degrees in her devotions, sometimes to one Mystery of her dear Lord and sometimes to another. In the early Church we find no such intense devotion to the passion as we do when Christendom has become sore rent and the Church is torn asunder. The invocation of

the Holy Spirit came as the Church felt more, amidst conflicting heresies, the need of Divine enlightenment and the aid of the Comforter. Again we see how the subjective side of religion as manifested in our hymns and sermons is peculiar to these later times, and so is the devotion to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. Here perhaps our own Church takes the lead, reserving the Sacrament after the Communion of the people and singing the *Gloria in Excelsis* as an act of Worship in Christ's Presence.

The Church has also met the different phases of the world's attack by adaptations in her discipline, in changes in her worship, and by forging new spiritual weapons of her own. Under the Guidance of the Holy Spirit the Church adopted the custom of fasting communion, and it became a universal one. She changed her public penitential discipline and substituted for it private sacerdotal confession. She made use of Eucharistic Vestments and of Eucharistic Lights. She no longer in the Liturgy bade the unbaptized and others to depart before the consecration of the sacred elements, but allowed the faithful, though not always receiving, to be present at the Holy Sacrifice. Although not on the same plane with these, she introduced incense as an adjunct of her worship and it became universally adopted. The use of unleavened wafer bread on the other hand, which is used among us only as a matter of convenience and has no doctrinal significance, is not a Catholic

custom. As the oneness of the whole Church in heaven and earth became more widely realized and its worship felt to be one, the saints were invoked, just as we call on all, even inanimate things, in the *Benedicite*, to praise the Lord. When evils were developed from the practice, our own Church, acting within her rights, omitted these invocations from her public services.

Thus the test of Catholicity of Church *practices* is not "*Quod semper, quod ubique,*" but — what has become the commonly accepted usage of the Church throughout Christendom. All the practices above mentioned have obtained in all parts of the Church, and have only fallen somewhat into disuse in the Anglican Church in evil times.

While thankful for the benefits which we have received from those lights of orthodoxy, the great post-Reformation Anglican divines, we ought as Catholics no more to follow English theology exclusively than Alexandrian, though Alexandria produced a Dionysius, an Athanasius, and a Cyril. Our loyalty, if we would be true to Christ, must not be narrowed into following these Anglican divines alone, while we honour all of them as theologians and venerate some as saints. As true Catholics we must primarily be loyal to that One, Holy, Catholic Church which Christ founded, rather than to any one of those divisions, be it Greek, or Roman, or Anglican, which the sin of man has made.

CHAPTER II

TRADITION

GOD speaks to us through His Church. We all need two conversions. We need to be converted from sin and take Christ for our Saviour, and to be converted to the Church and have her for our Mother. If a person has only experienced one of these operations he is only a half converted man.

Mother Church, like any other mother, expects her young children whom she gathers about her knees and teaches them her Catechism, to believe what she says, because she sits in the seat of authority and is wiser than they. But with true solicitude for their welfare, she desires them not to remain in the infant class, and believe merely because she says so, but to exercise their own powers of reason and understanding and come to see that her teaching is true for themselves. So in corroboration of her teaching she points them to the Holy Scriptures and Tradition. "If any one wishes," says St. Vincent, "to fortify himself with the Catholic faith" (notice he does not say *demonstrate* the truth of it), "he must do so by the authority of the Divine Law and the tradition of the Catholic Church."

In the Holy Scriptures or Divine Law he will find confirmation that the Church's teaching is true, and in Tradition how the Holy Spirit has

guided the Church in understanding them. Scripture and Tradition are to go together. For it is not every doctrine that can be proved from Holy Writ without the aid of Tradition, and so St. Vincent tells us to apply Tradition to Scripture. We must, he says, "receive the Holy Scripture in the Catholic sense."

Trained up in the Church, we must read Scripture with our inherited presuppositions. Here St. Vincent is at one with our best modern philosophical thought. It is not by reason alone we know anything. It is the whole Man that knows. And he knows according to his presupposition. He must feel his need of a Saviour before he can become a Christian. He must be converted from Protestantism and become Catholic minded before he can understand the Catholic religion.

Construed together, and in the light which the Church gives her children, both Scripture and Tradition will be found capable of such interpretations as will be in accord with her living utterance, and so confirmatory of it.

Tradition is usually divided into three heads, called universality, antiquity, and consent. This is the way in which St. Vincent of Lerins divided it, and it has been commonly accepted. The faith as delivered to the Church's children must be capable of bearing the three tests, of "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.*" This rule requires some discrimination and care in the application of its several parts.

First, that which is propounded as of faith must be the utterance of the whole Church. It is what the living Church everywhere to-day proclaims as the faith. These two points, the living utterance and the universal promulgation, St. Vincent recognizes. He says "we follow universality by confessing that to be the true faith which the whole Church throughout the world professes." He does not say what the Church has professed, but what the Church professes to-day. Here he recognizes the voice of the living Church. And it is what she says, not in one nationality or branch of the Church, but that which she proclaims everywhere. Here is universality. The reason for this is that the Church is a solidarity and that apart from the utterances of the solidarity no local Church or teacher has authority to bind in matters of faith.

But it may be asked, may not some new doctrine have crept in and so temporarily the Church of any one age be misled? To guard against this danger we must apply St. Vincent's next test, viz., the appeal to antiquity. The appeal to antiquity is to guard against novelty. In proof or disproof of novelty two points are to be noticed. One is that the appeal to antiquity does not necessarily mean an appeal to the first age. Thus in St. Vincent's account of the Council of Ephesus he mentions eleven fathers who were quoted. But of these, eight belonged to the fourth and fifth centuries, three to the third, and none earlier. This Council was held early in the fifth century and St. Vincent

wrote his treatise three years afterward. Antiquity then, according to his practice, does not mean necessarily the first age. Thus a doctrine is not proved to be novel because in the scanty records of the first age it may not be found.

The second point relates to the *number* of authorities by which novelty is proved or disproved. If a doctrine can be proved to have been generally used in ancient times, then it is seen not to be novel. "We follow antiquity," says St. Vincent, "by in no wise *receding* from those senses that the holy Elders and Fathers (*celebrasse*) set forth or commonly held." If a doctrine is found to be absolutely unknown, then on the other hand it is to be rejected as being novel. But it is not to be rejected as novel because it is not to be found in all or the majority of the Fathers. The test of novelty is satisfied as we have seen in St. Vincent's appeal to Ephesus. The existence of the doctrine is sufficiently certified by the reference to it by some of the accredited Fathers bearing witness to it as the Church's received teaching.

And now we come to the third test. The proclaimed doctrine must not only be free from the charge of novelty, but it must have been an accepted one. By whom must it have been accepted? St. Vincent says, "*ab omnibus*." But he does not mean by "all," all who called themselves Christians. He appeals to the "Holy Elders" and "the Holy Fathers." We must exclude then the heretics and schismatics, those who have been cast out or

left the Church. Also all those who, abiding in her, do not acknowledge her authority and are not walking by her rule of faith. Nor does he mean all the faithful in every age and clime, for this it would be impossible to prove; and also there would have been no sense in his saying, "*Quod ubique, quod semper*," for these tests would have been included in this one.

A doctrine to be believed must, he says, be proclaimed by the living Church, seen to be no novel doctrine, and one which has throughout the Church become accepted. It took time for the whole Church to adopt the definition of Nicea concerning our Lord's consubstantiality with the Father. The doctrine of our Lord's deity was part of the true faith from the beginning. But until defined and accepted by all, this further practical test, that St. Vincent gave to aid perplexed Christians in his day, could not be applied to it. If we would know the faith, first listen to what the living Church everywhere throughout the world, East and West, declares. Next, see by appeal to antiquity that it is not a novelty. Finally note if it has the imprimatur of acceptance. For this last note is not only a corroborating witness, but the seal of authority. So St. Vincent speaks of it as "the authority of ecclesiastical tradition."

The Church's appeal to "antiquity" proves her faithfulness to her trust; the appeal to "consent" confirms her teaching. The reason is this: it is because the Holy Ghost speaks through the whole

body, in the utterance of the *Ecclesia Docens*, that gives it its completed authorization.

Apply these tests to our Anglican position. We reject the Church of Rome, differing from her, in Church government, the Rule of Faith, in doctrine, discipline, and worship. We reject the papal supremacy as overthrowing the Apostolic government of the Church. We reject her doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, as thereby she cuts herself off from the communion of the universal Faith. Also because these dogmas have no support in Scripture and Tradition. Because she interprets the texts of Scripture, she alleges in their defence, in a sense unused by the Fathers. There are many other reasons, but we reject these new definitions of hers as being what St. Vincent calls "a new contagion which is trying to spread its foulness over the whole Church."

It has been asked whether St. Vincent's rule applies to Practice as well as Doctrine? It is applicable only to doctrine and to such practices as involve doctrine. St. Vincent says, "which ancient consent of the holy Fathers is with great care to be investigated and followed by us, not in all the lesser questions of the Divine Law, but only or at any rate principally in the Rule of Faith." In the case of rebaptizing of heretics, which was a case of a practice connected with a doctrine, St. Vincent applied his rule to it and condemned it. Other practices, like confession, express the Catholic doctrine of the power of the Keys; Fasting Commun-

ion, non-communicating attendance, and Eucharistic adoration are expressive of the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. The power of the Keys is stated in Holy Scripture and fully evidenced by antiquity. The mode of their application is a matter of adjustment. To-day and for many years it has been by private administration. The doctrine of the Real Presence is stated by Christ in the Holy Scriptures and by the consentient witness of Antiquity and the living voice of the Church to-day. Fasting Communion as an act of reverent devotion, and the allowance of non-communicating attendance as a concession in the Church's missionary wisdom, are practices which have grown out of this belief. For acts of Eucharistic adoration we have the testimony of St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his catechetical lectures. Theodoret bears witness to the custom of the East, St. Chrysostom for the Greek Church, St. Ambrose for the West, St. Augustine for Africa. All these Fathers speak of the custom as a matter of course and there is no record of any protest against the practice. It is therefore a practice which can stand the test of the Vincentian Canon. No one adores the elements. But beneath the outward manifestation, in a way unknown to science or philosophy, there is the unseen Christ, and to Him our worship is due.

Such things as clerical vestments for the different Church functions and her ministers, the sign of the cross in Baptism and at other times, lights

with their beautiful symbolical meaning as St. Jerome says of joy and of Christ as the Light of the World, incense so full of Scriptural meaning and significant of prayer and our acceptance only through the merits of Christ, are usages which by their general adoption by the Church are Catholic ones. It does not matter exactly when or how they began. They are the devotional expressions of the Church's increasing love of her Lord in rebuke to the coldness of the doubting and the denials of heretics. The use of wafer bread is not a Catholic custom, but is only a matter allowed by our Church as a matter of convenience. The name Protestant Episcopal, we may add in this connection, has not the hall mark of Catholic upon it, though doubtless some will contend for its retention with all the heat of orthodox heroes contending for an article of the Faith. No Catholic but acknowledges the right of a national Church to regulate the use of these things. No one of common sanity desires to revive the discipline or practices of primitive or mediæval times. Our American Church has repealed the rubric that binds the English Church to the ceremonial of the time of King Edward VI. She has wisely left her children free, subordinately to her express legislation and with the consent of their Ordinaries, to make what is Catholic their own.

We will delay our readers with but one further question. It has been said that the doctrines of such loyal and holy men as Pusey and Keble and Carter and Liddon and all the host of learned

Tractarians were innovations and unknown before their time in the Anglican Communion. In refutation of this erroneous opinion we will quote a few utterances of some of our recognized great Anglican writers.

Thus Bishop Jeremy Taylor says of Confession: "It is a very pious preparation to the Holy Sacrament that we confess our sins to the minister of religion." And again, "But the priest's proper power of absolving, that is of pardoning (which is in no wise communicable to any man who is not consecrated for the ministry), is a giving to the penitent the means of eternal pardon, the admitting him to the sacraments of the Church and the peace and communion of the faithful, because that is the only way really to obtain the pardon of God."

Of Eucharistic adoration, Archbishop Bramhall wrote: "The Sacrament is to be adored, said the Council of Trent, that is formally the Body and Blood of Christ, say some of your authors, *we say the same.* The Sacrament is to be adored, say others, that is the species of bread and wine. That we deny and esteem it idolatry. Should we therefore charge the *whole* Church (of Rome) with idolatry?"

Non-communicating attendance. The very fact that at the Coronation service, although only half a dozen receive, yet the whole congregation remains and that none of our great divines ever protested against this, but, on the other hand, took part in

various coronations, is a sufficient answer as to its introduction being till lately unknown.

Of unleavened Bread, Bishop Cosin says that the present rubric in the English Prayer Book permits the use of either leavened or unleavened bread, and so do many others.

Incense was used in Bishop Andrewes' Chapel and in Ely Cathedral almost down to our own times, and Archbishop Sancroft provided a form for the benediction of a censer. Indeed the Ornaments Rubric in the English Prayer Book calls for its use.

The number of the Sacraments. Bishop Taylor says: "It is none of the doctrine of the Church of England that there are two Sacraments only, but that two only are necessary to salvation."

Invocation of Saints. Bishop Forbes of Scotland, in his *Considerationes*, said: "Let not the very ancient practice received by the universal Church as well Greek as Latin, of addressing the Angels and Saints after the manner we have mentioned be condemned or rejected as impious or even as vain or foolish."

Purgatory. What the Anglican Church objects to about the Roman doctrine of Purgatory is that Christ has not made a full satisfaction for sin, that there remains a debt due to God's justice, which can only be satisfied by punishment hereafter, which punishment is like hell, only not eternal, and from this persons are released by the Pope on prayers, money payments, and good deeds. But prayers

for the dead is in the opinion of our Church far different. Jeremy Taylor says that our Lord found this practice in use and that He must tacitly have approved of it, which could not be the case if the practice were not innocent, pious, and full of charity.

Of course we are not saying that each of these divines approved of all these practices. In their struggles with Papist and Protestant they sometimes apparently seem to condemn in one place what they approve of in another.

For instance, while Bishop Taylor says as against the Papists that we must not adore the Sacrament, he says against the Puritans, "If Christ be not present, whom or whose Body do we receive, but if Christ be present . . . why do we not worship?"

This much we know, that there would be no difference between Pusey and Andrewes on the Real Presence, between Bramhall and Keble on the Eucharistic Adoration, between Thorndyke and Mortimer on the Holy Sacrifice, between Percival and Forbes on the Invocation of the Saints, between Carter and Jeremy Taylor on Confession. The greatest ingenuity cannot place in contradiction the *Considerationes* of Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh and *The Explanations of the Thirty-nine Articles* by Bishop Forbes of Brechin.

Bishop Cosin was persecuted as a ritualist in his day, and Mackonochie in ours. The Caroline Divines were spoken against as Papists in their time, and the Tractarians in these.

These venerable Fathers fought the battle of the

Faith in their age and bequeathed their heritage of Orthodoxy to us. They are our masters in theology, our models in piety, and we trust our advocates before the Throne of God.

CHAPTER III

CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

ST. VINCENT advised the Christian perplexed by the contrariety of opinions in his day to test any proposed doctrine. He was not to believe just because he was so told. He was not to shirk his responsibility by saying it was the Church's business to teach and he as an individual had nothing to do in the matter. It was his duty as a member of the Body of Christ to test any proposed doctrine by Scripture and Tradition. He was to search the Scriptures and be able by his own study to give a "reason for the hope that was in him."

We may be rightly impatient with that view of private judgment which makes every man judging apart from the Church and Tradition his own guide and an infallible pope to himself. On the other hand, we are not to accept the view that once having found there is a Church to teach us, we have nothing more to do, but to kick the ladder by which we have ascended to this pontoon from under our feet. This lesson St. Vincent teaches may well be laid to heart by all who call themselves Catholics, whether Roman or Anglican.

"Search and see." "*Tolle Lege.*" Take and read. The Scriptures and Tradition all, St. Vincent says, should read and study.

By Tradition, St. Vincent meant, as we have seen, three things. Did the whole living Church propose the doctrine, was it free from the charge of novelty, had it been concurred in by the faithful?

We have ventured to add to Vincent's rule one further test: the practical one of Christian Experience. What, we may ask ourselves, does the Christian Experience or Christian Consciousness bear witness to in any matter?

It is certainly a very useful test, to some minds more powerful than any other, and it may by God's blessing help to draw all schools of Churchmen closer together. This, we may remark if our Church is to fulfil its noble mission, is the thing pre-eminently to be laboured for by us all to-day.

Now there are those whose natural conservative tendency of mind leads them with St. Vincent to make their appeal to Holy Scripture and the Authority of the Church. There are others who naturally turn more to the practical results of Christianity as seen in conduct and character, and rest their belief on the approval of Reason and Conscience and the certification of truth by the Voice within. Then there are our Evangelical brethren who, while loyal to the Prayer Book, make the Word the lantern to their feet, and the indwelling Holy Spirit its interpreter. But I trust we may see that these three modes are not exclusive

of one another, but may walk as friends peacefully together, lending to each other a mutual support. May they make a three-fold cord, the less easily broken because the strands somewhat differ.

But before saying how this may be, let us make reply to an objection that is brought against us by our Roman brethren. "You Anglicans, or some of you, pretend to believe in the authority of the Living Voice of the Church; how can a Church, which you say is divided into three parts and out of communion with one another, have a Living Voice? To have a Living Voice, the Body must have a living Mouth, and your conception does not provide for one."

We make reply that by the Holy Spirit's indwelling in the Body of Christ, the Church is enabled to fulfil her prophetical office in declaring the Faith of the Gospel. He enables her to preserve the Faith in two ways. First, by guiding the Church in council assembled to protect the Faith against rising heresies by suitable definitions. But when the conditions are such that a council may be overborne by the world's power, or deceived by forged documents, or so involved in human frailty that it will decide amiss, then God by His Providence allows of divisions and takes away temporarily from the Church the power of making an authoritative utterance. In the first way He inspires the Church to speak, in the second He lays His hand on her mouth and keeps her silent. Thus the divisions of Christendom have

been the very means which Christ has used to prevent the Church from committing herself formally to error. But as each portion of the Church, East and West, proclaims what the whole undivided Church has set forth in its councils and sealed with its authority and what is held in common by them all, each portion speaks with the authority of the whole and declares the faith. In this way Christ dwelling in His Church speaks in each branch, saying "this is the way, walk ye in it." The *difference* here between us and Rome is not that we have no living voice and she has; that she has authority and we have not, but for *what* we each have authority. While for some of her doctrines Rome has only that part of the Church which is under the Pope; for all we teach as of faith we have the united utterance of the whole of Christendom.

And now to return to St. Vincent and his rule. An objection from an opposite quarter is sometimes brought against it that it ties us too much to the past. The world is whirling onward with gigantic energy. Discovery is daily opening gates with enchanting vistas. The darkness of ignorance and superstition is passing before the new dawn. "The past—it belongs to libraries and bookworms; it belongs to graves and sextons; it belongs to ruins and antiquaries. It has no claim on the living, working, thinking men, who are moving the world." Let us in religion break with authority as we have in science. Let us break with Tradition

and old dogmas and this antiquated reverence for Scripture. Let us be men of the twentieth century, not of mediæval or primitive times. Let us, in a word, be progressive.

Our answer to this line of thought is the common-sense one that it is impossible for us to break with the past. We are very largely what the past has made us. To break with Tradition and dogma and Holy Scripture is to cease being Christian. But if we cease to be Christians we go back to paganism and so cease to be men of progress. For with Christianity as in no other religion is the idea of progress inextricably interwoven. It is its very life. In this it differs from the religions of the East and all others. For Christianity is built upon a gradual and progressive revelation of God to man made according to His tender consideration of His children's needs. This unfolding of the Mind of God, throughout the ages, at last culminates in Christ. And Christ — the embodiment of the Eternal Light and Life — is Progress Itself. He is not only progress, but the element of progress is manifest in His method. He teaches progressively. He leads the Apostles slowly on from one stage of discernment to a higher respecting Himself. Yet He has not even at the close of His ministry announced to them all that it is essential they should know. "I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now." The Holy Spirit when He came was to unfold Christ's seed truths into their ripened fruit. See how this was done. Christ

had spoken of His Blood, as the Blood of the New Covenant, and the Apostles expanded it into the doctrine of the Atonement. He had suggested another mode of God's dealing with man in the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, and out from it and others like it there comes to us the blessed doctrine of Salvation through the grace of Christ. The Eastern Magi came to Bethlehem; the Syro-Phoenician woman gains by faith her petition; the Master speaks of sheep other than of His fold who must hear His Voice, and the truth subsequently dawns upon the Apostles of the breaking down of the old barriers and of a wider covenant, which should take in the whole Gentile world. Christ had said nothing about the forms of worship, but had Himself worshipped in the Synagogue and the Temple. And so under the Spirit's guidance the Church developed her two-fold forms of worship of Synagogue and Temple. The Recitation of the Divine Office as seen in Morning and Evening Prayer being one, and the spiritual sacrifice of the Eucharist being the other. The latter summing up the meaning of the old sacrifices, and setting forth the spiritual sacrifice of the New Covenant with all the glory that art and music and ceremonial can give it. For if the ministration "written and engraven in stones was glorious . . . how shall not the ministration of the Spirit" . . . "exceed in glory?"

So, too, the Church, acting under the Divine Guidance, was led on by outward circumstances as

well as interior prompting to the unfolding of the Apostolic College into three orders of the sacred Ministry; and the constraint of fierce heretical controversy led her to see with illuminated exactness the union of our Lord's dual natures in the one Person of the Eternal Son. Again, they realized that Christ as the Good Shepherd had led His sheep out from the old fold of Judaism, not that they might remain unsheltered and roam at will, but that He might gather all into the one larger Fold, where they were to be under-shepherds to Him. They received their power when the Spirit came and the New Fold of the Catholic Church came into organized being.

Men objecting to the Church's conciliar definitions forget that like the stone rim of an Eastern well, they only define the limits within which the living waters of the mind may rise, they do not repress active thought.

There is a distinction to be observed between those dogmatic definitions which protect the Faith and those speculative systems of theology which are the product of theologians. What we need is a more vivid realization that the Church is indwelt by a Living Present Christ, and His Presence and that of the Spirit makes her a Living Organism and a Living Church. Adopting the words of Liddon, we may say, "Christ is movement, and yet He is identity: He is to us what He was to our forefathers, and yet He is ever displaying to each successive generation new aspects of His power and

His perfections, to those at least who hold a true communion with Him. He is at one and the same time stability and progress, here preserving the unalterable lines of His one perfect revelation of Himself — there leading us on to new and enriched perceptions of its range and significance."

Is it not well then to add the test of Christian Experience to St. Vincent's rule? In addressing those without, her appeal takes on a somewhat different character. The need of religion must be first felt as a want before it can become a saving grace. But as to those without so to those within the Church appeals to men's understanding and conscience. Illuminated by the Spirit they must bear their witness to the truth of the Gospel and its transforming Power. The Church first teaches her children on the strength of her office and authority to receive the creed; and next having appealed to their illuminated intelligence and conscience, enables them to understand it; lastly, she leads and trains them, by acting it out and living it, to make it a part of themselves. So they pass from child-like acceptance and matured belief to the final and higher stage of knowledge. The soul comes not to believe only but to *know* God and Christ, for they dwell in Him, and He in them. "I do not deny," said Liddon, "that the language of the written Word and the grace of the Sacraments can alone reach the soul through the organs of sense, so that if all the copies of the Bible could be destroyed and the administration of the Sacraments

prevented, the ordinary means of grace would be cut off; but, when it is driven to bay and in the last resort, the soul falls back upon a certificated presence which is independent of sense. The world in the first ages could proscribe the Christian worship. It could destroy the Scriptures. But its legislation was just as powerless against the Presence of the Divine Redeemer in the inmost sanctuary of the soul as they would have been against the clouds and the sunlight. Our first fathers knew they had within their hearts One who would not desert them, One who would be a light to them when all else was darkness, One who when all outward aids were denied, was of Himself 'a well of water springing up to everlasting life.'"

Having this progressive character of the individual Christian life in mind we can more easily bear with those who differ from us. It was a wise remark of Archbishop Whately when asked what he thought of a Unitarian: "It depends," he said, "in which way he is travelling." So now it is with all Churchmen. Whither tendest thou? God's immanence in nature and so our natural union with Him is recognized by us all. It was so earnestly taught by Pusey and the early Tractarians that some called them Pantheists.

When Churchmen come to realize the further truth that what God is to the natural universe, that Christ the God-Man is to the new creation, and that it is by as actual a participation and union with His Nature as with that of the First Adam, we

can attain the gift of Eternal Life, the theological differences between the different schools in the Church will melt away. Just also as the sects see the value of the appeal to the general consciousness of Christians they will look toward the Church. For then they will see for themselves that we have something they have not. For if one thing is clear it is this: that in every part of the Catholic Church, East and West, its members as tested by their professions, devotional writings, hymns, and prayers bear witness to having in the Blessed Sacrament a Real Presence and a Gift that, save in a few individual cases, the Protestants do not claim to have.

CHAPTER IV

THE TESTIMONY OF EXPERIENCE

WHAT has the experience of Churchmen to tell us of these doctrines — of the Real Presence, of Adoration, of Sacerdotal Confession, of Ritualism? Let us begin with the first of these.

Contrast the belief and devotion which is to be found in the Orthodox Russian and Greek and Latin Churches, and wherever the Catholic faith has been recovered in our own, with the ordinary belief found in the sects respecting their communion. Their worship expresses what their religious experience tells them they do and receive. Catholic Worship testifies to a sacrifice that is offered, and

to the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood. Why should not the consciousness of three-fourths of Christendom be accepted to a fact which they have experienced? Where there are Orders and a Catholic Liturgy, the worshippers bear witness to doing and receiving something different from that which the sects claim. We admit the latter have what they claim to have. We believe the testimony their worship gives to their belief. Is it illiberal to say they have what their experience tells them they have: preachers of Christ and a memorial communion service, and to deny to them a priesthood and sacrificial Offering and Presence which they repudiate? But if we trust *their* experience, why should not they trust *ours?*

If they say most forcibly to the unbeliever and sinner, "Believe and trust in Christ and you will experience the peace of acceptance we Christians have," why may not Catholics ask them to trust the experience of so many millions of their fellow Christians in all lands and from the earliest times, and of the most saintly men, declaring that where there are orders and a Catholic Liturgy, there is a Real Presence and Gift which by their mode of worship and ordinary statements they acknowledge they do not possess?

Adoration goes along with the belief in the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. We do not define the mode of union between the two parts of the Sacrament. It is by no method known to science. It is by no physical change.

But believing in Christ's own words, He there makes Himself present to us. Any one who believes this even in the most untechnical way, who merely acknowledges that in some unusual manner Christ is present, must feel that an act of Adoration is due to Him. It comes from the law of courtesy, to say nothing more, that every act of condescension on the part of a superior demands an act of acknowledgment. If the King draws nigh and salutes us, we must salute Him in return. And our salute to Jesus our King is an act of homage. Wherever He is, as the saintly Bishop Andrewes said, Christ is to be adored. Thus the Christian who believes that His Lord is present under the veils by which He mercifully hides the glory of His Person from us, can but cast himself at His Feet in adoration. And so while it is true that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is offered to the Eternal Father and the prayers in general are made to Him, yet the Church must in her *Gloria in Excelsis* address herself to Jesus present after "the communion is done," and say "Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord; Thou that takest away the Sins of the World, have mercy upon us." The faithful believer in Christ as present can but worship Him along with the whole Company of Heaven, as the adorable, true, and only Son.

Belief in the Sacramental Presence of Christ seems to be, in our day, the touch-stone of faith, and adoration is its natural manifestation. Go where you will in Christendom, belief in the one

is ordinarily accompanied by the other. To those few who hold back from any mistaken fear, the assurance comes from millions of Catholics: "We have worshipped Him and He has by the Blessings bestowed accepted our homage." The Roman Communion may have its errors, but its devotion to Jesus in the Sacrament makes it dear to God. Not till the Anglican Communion realizes the Treasure she possesses, and her faith and love centres about her Lord and honours Him so condescendingly present with her, will she be able to accomplish her great mission. Money and intellect will never overthrow the walls of Jericho, but Christ's presence will. Such is the testimony borne by Christian experience.

What has it to say about fasting communion? It is an act of love and devotion to our Blessed Lord.

It began in very early times, became an ecclesiastical custom, was made a Church law, one which has never been formally repealed by our Church, though it has fallen into abeyance. No canonist would say it was a mortal sin for us not to come fasting, and no theologian would assert it to be any dishonour to our Lord's Body and Blood to take food before receiving, any more than it is to take food, which is allowed to be done, after it. Fasting is, however, an act of love. This raises the whole question of asceticism. The Indian Brahmins and the Manicheans regarded the body, or matter, as something evil from which they ought by macerations to deliver themselves. The Cath-

olic knows that all that God has created is good. Philosophers and Christians admit the need of self-discipline and self-denial. The Catholic does not disregard this duty. But the Church as a whole and the saints in particular have found a delight and joy in sharing in the life of their Master. How miserably petty is the argument that we are not bound to fast, because no rubric or canon obliges us to do so! What an ungenerous spirit is shown in the objection that it is not of obligation, because it cannot be proved to have existed in the days of the martyrs. Perhaps not, O twentieth century Churchmen, living in ease and often in luxury! Where do you show and bear in your body "the marks of the Lord Jesus"? If Christendom were asked why she fasts to-day ere she receives the heavenly Food, she would say it came to her out of a pierced Hand, and she fasted because she loved Him.

What has Christian Experience to say about Sacerdotal Confession? It is of no account to say of it, as of some other good things, that it may be abused. The Bible has suffered more than any other book in this way. It is of no force to say some surgeons and physicians are unskilful and so we ought not to use any of them. In giving the power to His priests to absolve, Christ foresaw the future, and knew what was best. The objections against confession are made mostly by those who have had no experience of its benefits. The world and Satan hate it, but the Church rejoices in it.

It is the tribunal of mercy. It is Jesus as the Good Shepherd among His flock. It restores the sinner, develops a manly character, helps to make saints.

It has two sides, man's side and Christ's. It gives to man an opportunity, by making a confession to God in the presence of His priest, to make an act of reparation such as otherwise he cannot make. For since the Incarnation our sins have been committed, not against the Invisible God, but against the person of Jesus Christ. As honour always prompts that an apology or reparation should be made according to the nature of the offence, so having wronged the *Man* Christ Jesus, it is the way of honour to make the acknowledgment in the presence of the *man* who represents Him.

We are apt to forget Christ's side in absolution. He loves to exercise it. He bought the right by His Cross and Passion. It cost Him much. But nothing more delights Him than, through His priests, as they exercise the ministry of reconciliation, to apply the pardoning, cleansing power of His Precious Blood.

And what is the result on the Church and Christian character? We may admit that Protestant countries are more prosperous, more civilized, more advanced than Catholic ones. In all that pertains to this world, Protestantism is superior to Catholicity. But so far as faith and spirituality are concerned, it is otherwise. Contrast the villages of northern New England with those of the French

Canadians. It is, however, rather by its highest results that the value of any religious system is to be tested. Let us note herein three things.

First: Wherever we find a lack of the Church's means of grace or of appreciation of them, we find less spiritual insight. The Protestant German writers are often great in intellect, but not living in the sphere of divine illumination, their intellects only hinder their spiritual apprehension of the Gospel. Again, outside the Catholic system there is less knowledge of prayer. Indeed, of it as an art or of those higher stages of it and those special communions with God which enable us to understand how Apostles and Prophets were inspired, by Protestants there is little known. Again, for the highest ideals and science of the Christian life we must go most frequently to such Catholic books as Thomas à Kempis and the Sancta Sophia; not to Protestant ones. The ordinary spirit can see no difference between the life of a saint like Pusey and the life of good men like Charles Kingsley. It has often not the spiritual capacity to discern a saint, for it does not like them. But the Oxford movement, noted for its learning, is yet more noted for the multitudes of saintly lives it has produced.

Again, Protestantism, with its lack of the Real Presence and Sacerdotal Confession, does not give us the consecrated lives of the Religious as Catholicism does. "The Religious life," said Lacordaire, "is the finest fruit of the Christian Church, and Protestantism does not produce it." Years ago the

writer heard two sectarians speaking of a certain hospital which was under the charge of sisters.

"Why," one asked, "do not some of our people consecrate their lives in this way as these High Church Episcopalians seem to do?"

"We can't get them," was the answer.

"Well, then, they must have something we have not got."

It is objected against those who are trying more closely to follow Christ, and who, in loyalty to our own Church and Prayer Book, are seeking to recover our inherited Catholic faith and practice, that they are Ritualists. They use incense, and wafer bread, and vestments, and much ceremonial. We can only reply that God is a Ritualist. Americans have never found Ritualism unmanly. Naught is ever done to attract, or for show. It is, as testified by their Christian experience, the outcome of their homage and love. It is a triviality to try and confine love's expressions to those of any past age. Love puts aside such pedantry, ever seeking to find new expressions of her devotion to her Lord.

"And the glory of our Altars
Is the homage of our love."

"By their fruits ye shall know them," said our Lord. "Why is it," said Bishop Whipple to an English prelate, "you can permit such things to be done by these men?" The English Bishop replied with tears in his eyes: "Those are the only men that seem to have found out that those poor people have souls to be saved."

"When I went to England," said Bishop Whipple, "I was much prejudiced against these men, as any one of Puritan ancestry could be; but their self-denying devotion in giving up all — wealth, position in society, and life itself — without anything to reward them in this life, led me to change my mind."

CHAPTER V

TWO GREAT PROVIDENCES

EVERY student of the history of the Anglican Church realizes in what a wonderful way it has been protected by Divine Providence. It has been in a remarkable manner restrained and disciplined and guided like Israel of old. Doubtless this has been in preparation for the greater, grander mission of evangelization that is now opening before her throughout the world. It is somewhat startling to read that four hundred millions of people, or about one-fourth of the world's population, are under British influence or rule. It requires no prophet's vision to see that the Latin race has largely done its aggressive work, and that apart from the Slavonic Mission for Asia and the East the era of the Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon has come.

It has come not only with its priceless gifts of civil liberty and legislative government, but with its fresh promulgation of God's Fatherhood and the Brotherhood of Man. It comes, bringing the divine revelation of man's duty to God and his fellow,

hand in hand with the demonstrations of science with which it is in accord. It comes not only with the glad assurance of a future life, but enfolds us in the environment here on earth of the blessings of a heavenly kingdom. It comes with the power not only to save men from some future punishment, but by its teaching and sacramental gifts to deliver men here from doubt and superstition and the thraldom of sin. It comes in the power of the Spirit to bring Christ into men's lives and homes and so help humanity on and upwards. It comes bringing to us, in a word, Catholic Christianity, emancipated from the narrowness of mediæval scholasticism, the uncertainties and barrenness of Protestantism, and the novel doctrines and worldliness and absolutism of the Papacy.

Looking back we may see that one, and perhaps the greatest providential blessing vouchsafed our Church, was the early death of King Edward VI. To be sure, he was followed by Queen Mary of unhappy memory. But the evils wrought by Mary were recoverable ones. Had, however, King Edward lived, the *Ecclesia Anglicana* would have lost her Catholic heritage. With all the tyrannous spirit of a Tudor monarch and all the narrowness and self-conceit of a reforming Calvinistic Protestant, the king would have made the English Church like unto the deformity of the continental Geneva reformers. We read in Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*, that Edward had determined to make further changes, and if the Bishops refused, to make

them himself by his own authority. The continuity of the Church would have been so broken, and her Catholic doctrines so marred, that she would have largely lost her heritage and become a withered branch of Christ's Church. She was preserved from this destruction by the merciful removal of this conceited and fierce "young tiger-cub," as both Dean Stanley, we believe, and Dr. Littledale called him. The Reformation movement then passed through several phases and lasted into the next century. The Church went painfully through her double struggle, first with Romanism and next with Puritanism, and emerged from it in 1662, with our present Prayer Book and Ordinal. The Prayer Book as thus finally established embodies our Reformation principles, which preserves to us our Holy Orders and the Sacraments and the Catholic Faith. As we think of what our Church is, and the magnificent future before her, we can never be too devoutly thankful to God for the great Providence that removed by death, and so early from his place of influence, King Edward VI. By it the Church was saved.

Another and, we deem it, the second great Providential blessing vouchsafed the Anglican Church, and one which has occurred in our own day, is the denial of the validity of our Orders by the Pope. It, like the former Providence, has wrought in a wonderful manner for the safety and preservation of the Anglican Church. It has helped to unite her members, has dissipated dreams of corporate

union with Rome, has painfully revealed to us by a practical example the worldly policy of the papacy, has destroyed the possibility of any belief on our part in the papal infallibility, has helped to fill the Anglican Church with new courage and trust, and enabled her to turn her eyes towards her true mission, and discern the tremendous work of evangelization, if she will but unite her forces, she may do for God.

We may see this the better by asking ourselves what would have been the result if the Pope had decided other than he did? In the first place, the hearts of many of our High Church people would have gone out to the Pope with unbalanced restraint. He would have been regarded as if he were a very father indeed of all Christendom; the protector of all who appealed to him; as the wisely if not divinely appointed judge of controversy; and who in the Apostolic See sat in the seat of authority and wisdom. Nothing can express the rejoicing that would have been felt and the enthusiasm that would have been kindled for the papacy and the trust that would have been created in it. By this strong tide of popular feeling, the former antagonisms of many would have been swept away. The old scriptural and patristic arguments against Rome would have melted like ice in a summer's sun. Emotion and kindly feeling would have dominated both prejudice, reason, and sound judgment. The past could have been by many all forgotten and forgiven, and with an enthusiasm like that

with which the English welcomed back the Stuarts, men would have begun to speak with exaggerated reverence of the decisions of the Holy Apostolic See.

But the Pope did not so decide, and the result was quite the contrary. Anglicans knew they possessed valid Orders. They knew this, not by mere argument, but by the assurance of God Himself working in them — they knew that they received Christ in the Sacraments. They could no more doubt this than they could doubt the existence of God or any essential fact of Christianity. Were I to doubt my orders I should not go to Rome, but give up Christianity; for there is no better proof of God's existence than there is for the truth of our Sacraments. None were looking, as we were skilfully misrepresented at Rome, to the Pope's decision to confirm their faith in what they knew to be true, but to see if the Pope was what he claimed to be. When he decided against what Anglicans knew with divine certainty to be true, then they knew with the same divine certainty that he was not infallible. It was seen to be a decision as contrary to the truth as if he had decided against Galileo and the planetary system.

So for many the glamour of the papacy passed away and the papal *Curia* looked in its nakedness but as a piece of skilfully constructed political machinery. The old man was, as we are told, fooled by Cardinal Vaughan and English Romans, whose pride and policy could not brook a contrary

decision. We cannot be too thankful that God wrought our deliverance as He did of old that of David when He turned Ahitophel's counsel to naught. Had there been a decision given favourable to Anglican Orders, the great barrier which has held so many back from joining Rome would have been removed. A disruption of the Catholic party would have taken place in England. Impatient of the Church's union with the State, and pained with the unrebuked heresies of rationalizing teachers, smarting under the malignant misrepresentations of their doctrines, tried by the persecutions of the Church Association and disheartened by the decision of the Archbishops, many would have sought peace in Rome. There would have been a veritable landslide. It would have been far worse than at the time of the Gorham decision. And it was in the air that many of the moderates and married priests would have petitioned Rome for an English Uniat Church. With such a secession the English Church would have become more and more Erastian. She could not have endured such another strain. The Oxford movement would have ended in disaster. The Church's spiritual life would have decayed and it would have found itself like Samson with its power gone. From this woeful calamity God by this Providence saved us. The papal idol to which some, not discerning its worldliness, had begun to turn, went down like that of Dagon before the Ark of the Lord. The hopes and dreams of Pusey and other kindly disposed unionists were

dissipated. Rome had during the century widened the breach by her additions to the Faith, and she has in this decision made reunion impossible. It has done us an immense service. It has begun to be realized that if God intended any outward reunion of Christendom it was not by way of union with Rome. Men began to see the truth, that they had partially turned away from, that Christ's prayer that His Church should be one as He and the Father were one, had been answered. We cannot doubt it. The unity of the Church is indestructible through union of its members with Christ. Corporate reunion of the three branches may be impossible, but Christian union is not. The duty of the different branches of the Church is to cultivate Church recognition and Christian fellowship, to learn from one another what each has of good and avoid what has anywhere been found harmful, and if possible, under certain conditions and special circumstances, to allow of inter-communion. This would be a real union of Christendom and is all that can be hoped for or wisely desired. For it may be questioned whether corporate reunion of the Anglican and Roman divisions would advance the cause of Christ. It is doubtful, because no such union could take place by any mere adjustment of creeds and theological terms. It could only come by such a revolution in the whole papal system, as would bring down the papacy with a crash, and as would thus upset the faith of half the Roman Catholics. On the other hand, no union could

take place with Anglicans without the Church's separation from the State and complete disruption of the Anglican Communion. The now cohering schools or parties would then fly apart like released gases. Satan could not do a better work for the destruction of confidence in any Church teaching. More souls in each communion would be lost to Christ than any good that could possibly come. Corporate reunion thus is neither desirable nor does it enter into the sphere of sane speculation. If it is, as a late writer has said, "impossible for Rome to alter," it is equally impossible for our Bishops, now delivered from the papacy, ever to put themselves under the papal rule. It were as much as to expect that the emancipated American slaves would vote themselves back into the bondage of slavery. It would be as sane as to expect the British Parliament to burn up Magna Charta, do away with legislative government and put the nation under an autocratic Czar. If any Anglicans are still looking Romewards, the best thing they can do for the cause of Christ is to give it up; to do nothing in the way of initiating it in the foolish idea that it would help reunion. Our duty as Catholics is to seek to gain the confidence of the Church in our loyalty and aim, and work in the spirit of a large charity towards all the members of our household, for holiness of life and the Catholic Faith.

IV

ABSOLUTION IN GOD'S WORD

PREFACE

THIS tract was originally published in England, many years ago, being put forth as one of a series by the Cowley Fathers. The Superior of the Society of St. John the Evangelist has kindly given permission to the present Editor to revise it, with such abbreviations and additions as would make it more useful in the American Church. It has consequently been rearranged and new matter added.

The texts of Scripture are cited by way of explanation and illustration, and not always in the rigid way of proof texts, save where some Christian dogma is involved. A Churchman, and for such the tract is written, brings a different rule of interpretation to Holy Scripture than a sectarian. The latter demands that every doctrine shall be capable of proof by an inclusive and exclusive logical process. The text must have a precise meaning which must exclude the possibility of any other. Thus, for example, the Unitarian explains the text "I and the Father are one," as not meaning necessarily one in substance, but one in moral agreement. The Presbyterian demands that it be proved from Scripture

that local Bishops were established by whom alone the power of ordination was exercised. The Baptist asks not for inferences from the baptisms of households, but explicit statements that infants were baptized. Other illustrations will occur to the reader.

They all, as Churchmen know, proceed upon the error that Christianity was founded on a Book. "The Bible and the Bible only" has been their chart and compass. The foundation of a Churchman's belief is organically different. Christianity came into the world, not as a philosophy, but as a truth and life, embodied in an institution. The Church existed before the New Testament was written. It is not based on the Scriptures, but on Christ. It will live on till the end of time, for Christ abides in it, guiding it by His Holy Spirit, that it may bear witness to the Faith once delivered to the Saints. The Churchman, living in the Church, hears her voice speaking through the Creeds and Liturgy, saying, "This is the way; walk ye in it." His rule of Faith is: "The Church teaches, the Bible confirms her teaching."

He does not therefore apply to the Scriptures the method which the Protestant is obliged to do. He considers first what the whole Catholic Church holds. He then sees that the Scriptures are susceptible of a construction conformable to the Church's traditional teaching. They thus furnish a corroborative witness to the Faith.

He sees also that the Scriptures, unlike any other

book, have a meaning that only the spiritually illuminated can discern. No learning, no logic, no human reason, can unlock its hidden treasure. It does not reveal its meaning to scholarship. One must live within the sphere of divine illumination to be illuminated. It is the Children of Israel who have light in their dwellings. One must pray like the prophets to comprehend the prophets. One must know of the vision to understand the seers. One must be of kin to the Evangelists to see in the Old Testament what they saw. We do not discover the meaning of God's Word by getting at the intentions and meaning of the writers. It has a meaning fuller, richer, deeper, than the writers themselves knew. The Church has her own golden rule of interpretation. What the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Catholic Church reads out of the Old Testament, in type, figure, or prophecy, that the Holy Spirit, its Author, put into it, that it might be so interpreted. This is the way Christ and His Apostles quoted Holy Scripture, and in that spirit the reader will find it used in this book.

The subject treated is the Priest's Power of Absolution and the layman's privilege of resorting to it. The first is inherent in every priest, the second is the right of every layman. The spontaneous desire by penitents for an assurance of pardon argues the Church's possession of a power to satisfy it. The authorization of the Apostles to exercise this power is one of our Lord's most merciful endowments of His Church. In the preparatory

Hebrew dispensation, Confession was made at times in the priest's presence, and the priest could offer, in the penitent's behalf, a sin-offering. But all that the sprinkling of its blood could do was to reconcile the Jew to his covenanted state; it could not take away the guilt and penalty of sin. Now unto His priests Jesus has entrusted His Precious Blood, wherewith all nations may be sprinkled and sins may be blotted out. No sinner is so vile but the Sacred Heart is open to him, no sins are so black and loathsome that the Precious Blood cannot cleanse. No matter how obdurate and rebellious, how old in sin, how inveterate in relapses, the abounding mercy persistently offers pardon. Opening the roll in the synagogue at Nazareth, Jesus declared that He had come to fulfil Isaiah's prophecy, "to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to captives, to set at liberty them that were bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." That year of Jubilee has not passed away. The tones of the silver trumpets are ceaselessly proclaiming deliverance to sin's captives. It was not to be their privilege only who knelt at His Feet, to hear His life-giving word, "Son, Daughter, thy sins be forgiven thee," but everywhere, and till the end of time, penitents should have given them by Christ, speaking through His priests, the same blessed assurance of pardon.

And the terms of its bestowal are as full of love as the width of its extension. To offer this pardon cost Him much, no less than His dread Passion.

Ages of contemplation in the Beatific Vision will not exhaust its depths. But what was won by so terrible a conflict, humiliation, and agony, He freely gives. It is given without money and without price. It is given for the very seeking.

> "It is only heaven that is given away,
> It is only God can be had for the asking."

Indeed in this holy mystery Christ comes seeking us. As if we were His only care, He makes search as the Good Shepherd. He comes to find us in our wanderings, to rescue us from the thickets wherein we have been caught, to take us up, trembling and with bleeding feet, and in His Own Arms to bear us safely back to the fold. He comes as the Good Samaritan to save us, robbed and wounded and ready to perish. But ere He bears us to the shelter and care of the Inn, He first probes and cleanses our wounds, and pours in the oil and wine; and setting us on His own beast, reconciles us to Himself by Absolution. We are wanderers from Jerusalem, and Christ must come and walk beside us and light again the torch of faith in our hearts, ere He can enter in and abide with us, and we discern Him in the Breaking of the Bread. In the Holy Eucharist He invites us to be His guests at the marriage feast; but freely provides by Baptism, and Absolution for our post-baptismal sins, the wedding garment that we may come with cleansed souls into the King's presence. The reason why frequent communions do not advance the soul more, why they so

often deteriorate into formality, why weekly Communions, if unprepared for, are fraught with danger, is because souls venture into the King's presence uncleansed and unabsolved. They enter without fear and not having on the wedding garment. They use the mystery of the Eucharist as if it were the ordained channel of forgiveness of sins. In the former, Jesus summons the just to the banquet of His Love; by the other mystery He prepares them for it.

But it is not a question of the Saviour's merciful provision that keeps souls from using Confession, so much as their insensibility to the guilt and effects of sin. Their eyes are closed to things spiritual while they believe them open. They are blind and think they see. They say they are "rich and have need of nothing. They know not that they are wretched and miserable, and poor and blind and naked." They are carnally minded and dead, yet think they are alive. Now, the saints have said: Not to feel one's sins is to be on the way to the Eternal Loss. For as all must admit, no one can stand before God, in Whose presence the heavens are not clean, in his own righteousness. And if he does not feel his own sins, of which in God's sight he is guilty, how can he ask for mercy for them? And if he neglects to seek God's mercy where it is freely extended to him, now in this sacrament of His Grace, how can he claim what he has openly neglected, at the judgment seat of God? Blessed then are they who feel their sins now. It is a token of God's love to

them. It shows they are not forsaken. It shows that the soul is spiritually alive. It gives them a personal, experimental knowledge of God. They have by the very pain they bear a sure witness that union with God is life, health, and joy, and separation is darkness, misery, death.

They should treasure the remembrance of the pain as a certified evidence of God's Love. And if haply free from great sins, yet not to feel the pain of lesser ones is the mark of a sluggish or decaying spiritual state. For the nearer one gets to God the more sensitive his spiritual nature becomes. The more, therefore, he feels little sins. The more, too, God often in love visits him for them. He does this by withdrawing favours of light and peace. What the soul is likely to do, feeling the pain, is to seek to get rid of it. The soul wants the old feeling of peace and conscious communion with God back again. In this, however, it is only seeking self. It is only another subtle form of self-love. It should patiently bear the pain. Like Miriam, the soul after sin must stay awhile outside the camp. The soul must learn the lesson "that it is good for me to have been in trouble." It must learn to humble itself before God and tarry His leisure. It must seek not to get rid of its punishment, but to sorrow for God's sake because He has been offended. It must arm itself with revenge against self, and, love-impelled, seek to make some reparation to its Lord. When it feels this, it will not endeavour merely to pray itself back into peace, but will go to Confession.

As the soul advances to higher degrees of sanctity, its love burns like fire. God is in all its thoughts. It is crucified with Christ and risen in Christ. It is dead to the world and has its conversation in heaven. The Holy Spirit rules its acts, words, thoughts, feelings, emotions, its sorrows and its joys. It rests on God as the sea birds rest at night on the bosom of the ocean. Rather Christ lives within them, extending the virtues of His own life. They say with St. Paul: "Not I, but Christ liveth in me." Yet to whatever degree of union or height of prayer they may have attained, Jesus in the tribunal of His Mercy only draws them with increasing attraction. They are one with Him, and He is one with them. They resort to Him in this mystery, because He loves to have them come. They want to be what He would have them to be. They desire nothing but what He desires, and their joy lies in union with His joy. Confession and Absolution have a fresh meaning, and they resort to the mystery as an act of increasing love.

So great and merciful a provision of God's mercy could not fail to arouse opposition. Men do not object to being told there is a God, but they object to the worship of Him. Church people will not object to the Prayer Book doctrine of the Real Presence, but they object to kneeling down before Christ as if He were really there. Christians do not object to hearing about Repentance and Confession, provided it does not mean anything very practical. They believe in confession made to

God, but object if it is made in the presence of a priest, who can convey to the penitent God's pardon. The world, hating every Christian practice, hates this worst of all. It maliciously invents false accusations against it, just as it did against Christ Himself. Satan is enraged by it, for it delivers so many souls from his power. He well knows how to deceive and entrap men, but the fulness and freeness and power of the absolving grace baffles him. So he hates it, and plots to keep souls from it. To be against Confession is to be on Satan's side.

It has been part of God's marvellous goodness to the Anglican Church that, after so much neglect, He raised up great saints like Pusey and others who revived this ministration of mercy. The history of its revival shows that as the Church awakened to higher standards of holiness, the laity, claiming their Prayer Book privileges, pressed on the clergy their duties as priests. The increasing use of Confession, wrote Dr. Pusey in 1846, "has not been the result of any theory, or of any wish on the part of any of the priesthood to restore what they thought to be for the benefit of the Church. It originated not in the agency of men, but in the grace and providence of Almighty God, shaking the inmost souls of penitents and giving them the longing for that relief He had appointed."

The increased use of Confession in the Anglican Communion has been the work of the Holy Spirit. If, in early ages of the Church, confessions were publicly made, in her wisdom the Church modified

her practice and adapted it to present needs. The Church, like a good householder, brings forth, out of her treasures, things new and old. She preserves the old apostolic government, priesthood, and faith, but varies the mode of the application of her spiritual powers. Her rites, ceremonial, devotions, and practices grow. We are not bound in these matters to what can be proved to have existed in early times. The Church is a living organ of the Holy Ghost. And as He has led the Church Catholic into its beautiful ceremonial worship and taught her to pray for the dead and of her oneness with the saints, so has He taught the Church how best to use the absolving power of the priesthood. She abolished for the most part public penance and substituted the private confessional.

The Anglican Reformers also saw fit to alter the discipline of our communion and not make Confession once a year compulsory. By leaving it a voluntary matter it was thought a more sincere repentance would be secured. As the result has been that it fell largely into disuse, it is open to question whether the policy was a wise one. But the Church did not repudiate the sacerdotal powers of the priesthood. She enjoined penance in certain cases. She bade the priest move the sick and dying to Confession. She invited her children when disquieted to seek the priest for his counsel and Absolution. She did not thus regard Absolution as only a medicine for the very sick, but as health food for the convalescent, and that is all the greatest saints

are. Our Church places thus no barrier to the use of Confession. She is Catholic, though many of her children are shy to own her so. Let all who love her, the more earnestly respond to her voice. The Blessing of God upon her waits upon the lives of her saints. Every soul that is seeking after perfection is helping on the Church's development. They are the Church's best treasures and are very dear to God.

Some of the devotional reasons for the use of this means of grace are these: Confession is an act of humiliation, and as an aid to humility is to be welcomed. It is an act of reparation, which honour points out, which can be made in no other way. It develops courage and will-power, so greatly needed in these days of softness and ease. It affords opportunities for making fresh starts in the spiritual life, which is a rule of progress with the saints. It is a constant check upon sin, for it enforces self-examination and helps us to keep Jesus in mind. It gives your spiritual guide a better chance to aid you in self-conquest and growth in holiness. It anticipates the judgment day and closes the mouth of your accuser. It calms the soul's fears, for it has not left unused aught the Lord has left for its welfare. It brings Christ's Absolution and the assurance of your acceptance in Him. It increases strength against future temptations and gives present peace to the soul.

Remember that our Church allows you to go to what priest you choose; and, therefore, choose one

of wisdom. Remember your confession must be made in person and not by letter. Remember that the priest can never reveal anything told him in Confession, nor allude to the penitent, out of Confession, to anything said in it, nor the penitent to him. Remember to make acts of contrition before you go, and, beside performing the simple penance, to make an act of thanksgiving. Thank God for His generous gift of cleansing and for the peace of heaven in your soul. Make acts of faith and assurance. "He has forgiven all my sin." "I am saved in Him." "He is mine and I am His."

May the writer presume to say to his brethren of the clergy, that he has found no more effective way of teaching than, having preached a sermon, to distribute at the church door a tract on that same subject. It was so to aid his brethren that this series of Tracts has been written.

ABSOLUTION IN GOD'S WORD

1. *Question.* Who alone has power in Himself to forgive sins?

Answer. God.

I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions. — *Is.* xliii. 25.

2. *Q.* Which Person of the Blessed Trinity acts immediately in judging sinners? Is it the Father?

A. No.

The Father judgeth no man. — *S. John* v. 22.

3. *Q.* How does the Father act?

A. By His only-begotten Son.

But hath committed all judgment unto the Son. — *S. John* v. 22.

4. *Q.* Does not God the Son possess this power inherent within Himself, as fully as God the Father?

A. Yes.

All things that the Father hath are mine. — *S. John* xvi. 15.

5. *Q.* What do you mean, then, by saying that the Father has committed judgment unto the Son?

A. In His human nature, as the Son of Man, He has received delegated authority to forgive and to judge.

And hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man. — *S. John* v. 27.

6. *Q.* But does the Son of Man exercise this power before the last day?

A. Yes. He forgave the sins of penitent persons when He was upon the earth.

> He said unto her, thy sins are forgiven. — *S. Luke* vii. 48.

7. *Q.* How did Christ claim to exercise this power?

A. In virtue of His office as the Son of Man.

> But that ye may know the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then said He to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house. — *S. Mark* ii. 10.

8. *Q.* Did He forgive sins as a favour to those whom He pleased?

A. No. He performed an act of judgment in forgiving sins, because He saw the person to have the necessary disposition.

> He said to the woman, thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace. — *S. Luke* vii. 50.

9. *Q.* How does our Lord Jesus Christ exercise this power now He has ascended?

A. By sending others in His Name.

> As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. — *S. John* xx. 21.

10. *Q.* Can they act as effectively as Christ Himself?

A. Yes; for they are His accredited agents through whom He acts.

> He that receiveth you receiveth Me, and He that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me. — *S. Matt.* x. 40.

11. *Q.* What is their ministry entitled by reason of this authority which they as Christ's representatives possess?

A. It has various names.

The Ministry of the Keys. Given personally to St. Peter to open the Kingdom to Jews and Gentiles.

> I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. — *S. Matt.* xvi. 19.

The Ministry of Reconciliation. Given to all the Apostles.

> And hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. — 2 *Cor.* v. 18.

The Ministry of Righteousness. Expressive of the office of the Christian priesthood.

> If the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. — 2 *Cor.* iii. 9.

12. *Q.* What titles specially belong to those who have this authority?

A. Stewards of the Mysteries of God.

> Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. — 1 *Cor.* iv. 1.

Ambassadors for Christ.

> Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. — 2 *Cor.* v. 20.

13. *Q.* Does Christ take part in their official acts when they bind or loose?

A. Yes. He acts by them.

> Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. — *S. Matt.* xviii. 18.

14. *Q*. Is the belief in this Ministry of reconciliation and pardon an essential part of the Christian faith?

A. Yes. It is contained in the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in the forgiveness of sins."

> Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name among all nations. — *S. Luke* xxiv. 47.

15. *Q*. What is meant here by the words "in His Name"?

A. The Name of Christ means His authoritative Presence in His Church, gathering men into His Kingdom.

> When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ they were baptized. — *Acts* viii. 12.

16. *Q*. Does the Name of Christ imply an appointed ministry?

A. Yes. "To bear God's Name" is the special designation of the highest authority in the Old Testament, Exod. xxiii. 21; and so it is "to bear Christ's Name" in the New.

> He is a chosen vessel unto Me to bear My name. — *Acts* ix. 15.

17. *Q*. Does the Absolution of the Christian priesthood convey real pardon?

A. Yes; if it be received with a right mind.

If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin. — 1 *John* i. 7.

18. *Q*. When did our Lord give the power of absolution to men?

A. After His resurrection.

He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained. — *S. John* xx. 22, 23.

19. *Q*. Had not our Lord used words somewhat similar on another occasion?

A. Yes. In the time of His prophetical ministry He united the Apostles to His prophetical office, empowering them not only to teach, but to teach with authority. They were to declare and decide on matters of doctrine and discipline judicially.

If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: but if he neglect to hear the Church let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. — *S. Matt.* xviii. 17, 18.

20. *Q*. What is the difference between these two grants of power?

A. One empowers the Church to exercise a judicial authority over all spiritual causes and on

all questions of religious truth and error. The other bestowed on the Church the power to deliver souls from Satan and the consequences of transgression by the remission of their sins, or to bind them upon them by retaining them.

Thus S. Peter retained the sins of Ananias and Sapphira, and the post-baptismal sin of Simon Magus, and S. Paul smote Elymas the Sorcerer with blindness and delivered the backsliding Corinthian Christian unto Satan. — 1 *Cor.* v. 5.

So S. Paul restored the penitent. — 2 *Cor.* ii. 10; and bade the clergy to restore Christians overtaken in a fault, in the spirit, not of arbitrary authority, but of meekness. — *Gal.* vi. 1.

21. *Q.* What is the meaning of the words "remit" and "retain," and what effect have they on the person of the offender?

A. Sin is an act against God, for which God's justice demands punishment. The words "remit" and "retain" have reference to this punishment.

The word "remit" is translated elsewhere (*S. Mark* vii. 8), as "laid aside." The sins being put aside, the punishment is no longer due for them, and, as the word "remit" is elsewhere translated (1 *John* i. 9), the sinner is "forgiven."

"Retain" signifies to keep in its place, "to hold fast onto." "Retaining" holds onto the sin and so the debt to God remains due and the sinner remains unforgiven.

22. *Q.* Were not these words spoken to Jews, and would they have conveyed the idea of absolution to them?

A. As Jews conversant with confession (Lev. v. 5), and with the priest's office of reconciling persons to their covenanted state under the law, it is possible. But more probably they were, like many other sayings of our Lord, not understood by the Apostles at the time of their utterance, or only partially so. It was only after the Holy Spirit came, and the growing needs of the Church pressed on them, that they began to realize their spiritual powers and to apply them. They slowly, almost painfully, discerned that the Gentiles were to come in, not through the gate of Judaism. The three orders of the Ministry were only slowly and by constraint of circumstances unfolded from that of the Apostleship. The atoning value of Christ's death on the Cross was gradually discerned.

> Our Lord declared: "I have yet many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He the spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all Truth." — *S. John* xvi. 12, 13.

23. *Q*. Is not the action of the Apostles the best explanation of the charge given them?

A. Undoubtedly their action helps to explain the words. They went forth and preached the Gospel and baptized and did many other things. By Baptism penitents were made members of the Church and received remission of their sins. Absolution is the sacrament of restoration of Church members, and can only be given to those who have been baptized. Unless Christians therefore fell away, there would be no necessity for its use. We

know but little of the Apostles' private dealings with lapsed Christians. We should not expect to find many such cases in the Scriptures. Any one case, however, like that of the fallen Corinthian, shows they knew they had the power, and exercised it.

> If I forgive anything, to whom I forgave it, forgave I it in the Person of Christ. — 2 *Cor.* ii. 10.
>
> And Peter said unto him, Æneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole. — *Acts* ix. 34.

24. *Q.* How are we to get at the best explanation of these words of Christ?

A. The Spirit dwelling in the Church best expounds the words. Christ gave to His Church a certain power. It was to be used and applied as the Holy Spirit guided the Church. The Apostles were to use it as seemed best to them, and best to meet the needs of their day. The early Church might have its system of penance and public confession. Later the Church, feeling that so it best subserved holiness, might make it private. She might also, by opening it more widely, extend its beneficent work as an instrumentality of sanctification.

> She is like unto the householder which bringeth forth out of his treasures things new and old. — *S. Matt.* xiii. 52.

26. *Q.* But did not Christ, in His utterance to the Apostles, simply mean that they were to remit and retain sins by Baptism and the preaching of the Word?

A. No. Sin cannot be remitted or retained by preaching, for the words "remit" and "retain,"

as interpreted by the Scriptures, do not apply to it. But the commission is ordinarily taken as covering Baptism and all the other activities of the Church in her relation to sinners. By uniting the sinner unto itself in Baptism, the Church first communicates to him Divine Life. By all her sacramental ministrations, including Absolution, she nourishes and develops that Life. By Absolution she does not forgive only, but cleanses and resuscitates the soul.

> This my son was dead and is alive again, was lost and is found. — *S. Luke* xv. 24.

27. *Q.* Is there any reason, however, for us to think, that Absolution was not only included in this commission but specially designated?

A. Yes; and for two reasons. If we examine our Lord's life we find that it was divided into His Prophetical or public ministry, His Priestly and suffering one, and His Royal and risen life. In each portion He associated the Apostles with His special office. When exercising His prophetical office, He gave them their first authority to preach (St. Matt. x.), and to decide authoritatively concerning the faith (St. Matt. xviii). When He was, as high priest, making in the Upper Chamber the free will offering of Himself, He commissioned the Apostles to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Do, or offer, this, as a memorial of Me. So in the Royal days of His Victory over death and Hell, He gave them as its fruits, mission and jurisdiction throughout the world; authority to make persons subject

to His Kingdom by Baptism; and to exercise in His Name the power which belongs to a King of pardon and condemnation. Christ progressively commissioned the Apostles. They were separately authorized to preach, to intercede, to adjudicate, to heal, to bless, to ordain, to baptize, to offer the Eucharist. So we judge that here the power to absolve was specially given. Gradually, by separate acts, were the Apostles commissioned, finally, by one act on Pentecost, were they empowered.

According to the proverb, Christ constructed His Church: "Prepare thy work without (in the counsels of Eternity), and make it fit for Thyself in the field (during His visible ministry), and afterwards build Thy house. — *Prov.* xxiv. 27.

Moreover as the commission to preach was accompanied by the act of sending the Apostles forth to preach (St. Matt. x.), and healing with anointing (St. Mark vi. 13), and Baptism with water, and the offering of the Eucharist, with the act of priestly investiture of washing the feet (Ex. xxix. 4; Lev. viii. 6), so pardon by the word of mouth was signified by the act of breathing, accompanied by a gift of the Holy Spirit. It is therefore a legitimate inference that not a mere general but a distinctive ministration was assigned the Apostles by the Lord's word and act.

The gifts of Christ by His Spirit were divided severally.

28. *Q.* Why was the first announcement of this gift of Absolution made to the assembled Apostles after Christ's Resurrection?

A. Because it was the King's clothing of them with the first fruit of His great victory. As His first Resurrection acts were to reveal Himself to the Magdalene and to go after the two wandering disciples and to send word to the penitent Peter, so His first empowering of His Church is with the kingly and sovereign power of pardon. Nothing more fitting, nothing grander can be conceived.

> He taketh up the simple out of the dust: and lifteth the poor out of the mire; That he may set him with the princes: even with the princes of his people. — *Easter Ps.* cxiii. 6–7.

29. *Q*. Was not the gift to the Apostles something unique, belonging to their unique position and relation to Christ, and so theirs alone?

A. No. The disease of sin is not unique but universal, and the Christian ministry to-day stands in the same unique relation to it as did the Apostles, and it has the same Holy Spirit abiding with it for the work.

> As Thou hast sent Me into the world even so have I sent them into the world. — *S. John* xvii. 18.
>
> And Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world. — *S. Matt.* xxviii. 20.
>
> And I will pray the Father and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever. — *S. John* xiv. 16.

30. *Q*. Were not the Apostles exceptional persons, who had a gift of discerning spirits, and who, our Lord knew, would not abuse the power, whereas it is claimed now by all priests whether spiritually minded or not?

A. No other gift is required than that accompanying the grace of order to discern whether a sinner is repentant. The humblest priest who has been gathered into fellowship with the Apostolic order, and so with Christ, becomes Christ's organ for the transmission of His absolution. His unspirituality or unfaithfulness cannot hinder the efficiency of Christ's Word in this or in any other sacrament.

> We have this treasure in earthen vessels. — 2 *Cor.* iv. 7.
>
> My Word that goeth out of My Mouth: it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please — and whereto I sent it. — *Is.* lv. 11.

31. *Q*. Should we not expect, if so important a power was given, that its conditions or limitations would be stated along with it?

A. No. Because they are necessarily understood. Just as when it is said that God forgives, it is understood that God cannot forgive without repentance. So repentance is implied when it is said: "Whose sins ye remit they are remitted." All the gifts and promises of God are made upon explicit or implied conditions.

> Christ said, Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. — *S. John* xv. 14.
>
> Here the condition is stated. God, it is said, will protect Israel, but, it is understood, if they will walk in His ways.

32. *Q*. Why did Christ, in communicating the gift, breathe on them?

A. For several reasons. Breath signifies the Holy Spirit. "The Spirit of God hath made me and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (Job xxxiii. 4). Also to signify the instrumental agency of the communication of forgiveness, viz., by the absolving word. As Baptism was to be with water, so Absolution was to be by breath or speech. "Now are ye clean through the word which I have spoken unto you" (St. John xv. 3). Moreover as all forgiveness is a mystery of mercy and reconciliation, it was fitting its symbol should be that of love.

> When he was a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him. — *S. Luke* xv. 20.

33. *Q*. Was it at this time, and by this act, the Apostles were consecrated?

A. No. It was only one act in the long process of their consecration. Our Lord gradually gathered them into union with His triple offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, and then on the Day of Pentecost, they were empowered by the gift and perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost to perform those offices to which they had been commissioned. They then became, and not before, "able ministers of the New Covenant" (II Cor. iii. 6).

> They became enabled to do those things they had been commissioned to do.

34. *Q*. What was the difference between this gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed on the evening of the Resurrection and that on the Day of Pentecost?

A. Before Pentecost the gift of the Spirit bestowed was such as prophets and others had received for their work. Such gifts are known in theological language as the gifts of "actual" grace. It is a grace given to aid in the performing of certain acts or duties. At Pentecost, however, the Holy Spirit came down *personally*, to abide perpetually in the Church. He came down once for all, and that act can no more be repeated than can the Incarnation. He never descended into any sect, but only once and into His Church. He did not come to take the place of an absent Christ, but to unite the Church to Christ, so making Christ present in it. Though He came down once for all, His presence at other times might be specially manifested (Acts iv. 31). But it was at Pentecost the Apostles' consecration was completed. They had been gradually gathered into fellowship with Christ's offices and now were gifted with the Spirit for their performance.

> According as His Divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. . . . Exceeding great and precious promises, that by these ye might be partakers of the Divine Nature. — 2 *S. Peter* i. 3, 4.

35. *Q*. How does our Church use this form, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," in the Ordination of Priests?

A. She invokes the Holy Spirit, but not merely as our Lord did on the day of His Resurrection, for one specified particular purpose, but that the

Ordained may be empowered for the whole "office and work of a priest"; and that she means a priest in a sacerdotal sense, she specifies the recognized sacerdotal act of forgiveness of sin. "The office and work of priest" includes that of offering the Holy Sacrifice, and absolution is the preparation for it.

> Then the Bishop having laid his hands on those about to "receive the Order of Priesthood" shall say, Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments. — *The Form of Ordering Priests, Book of Common Prayer.*

36. *Q.* When our Lord said to the Apostles, "Whosesoever sins ye remit," were there not other disciples present, and what share had they in the commission?

A. Most probably there were others present. (St. John xx. 19.) Forgiveness of sins has reference both to sin in its relation to God, requiring spiritual pardon, and in its relation to the Church and Church members, requiring also ecclesiastical pardon and personal reconciliation. The latter is to be exercised in one way and the former by its own channel. Just as in the old dispensation the priest alone could offer the sin-offering, so now it is the priest alone who can forgive sins in their relation to God, for He alone is charged with "the ministry of reconciliation." (II Cor. v. 18.)

37. *Q.* But did not the Holy Spirit come upon all those who were assembled together at Pentecost, and so were not all then consecrated?

A. The Holy Spirit came upon all, for the whole Church was to be a ministerial body of prophets, kings, and priests, but He empowered the members of it according to the respective offices and duties assigned them in that body. And to the Apostles alone had the power of ordaining and administering the sacraments been given.

> God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him. And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles. — 1 *Cor.* xii. 18, 28.

38. *Q.* Did He intend the Apostles to give this power to others?

A. Yes. He said,

> All power is given unto Me in heaven, and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. — *S. Matt.* xxviii. 18–20.

39. *Q.* How do we know that this power was given not only to the Apostles, but also to their successors?

A. Since Christians are always liable to fall into sin, there is just as much need for the power of forgiveness now as in the days of the Apostles. Therefore our Lord spoke to His Apostles as repre-

senting an order of men who should continue in the Church "to the end of the world."

40. *Q.* Did any one exercise this power in the Apostles' days besides the original eleven on whom Christ breathed?

A. Yes; St. Paul exercised it as part of the Apostolic office.

> If I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the Person of Christ. — 2 *Cor.* ii. 10.

41. *Q.* Is there any other indication of persons besides the Apostles exercising this power in their lifetime?

A. Yes. St. Paul authorized this ministry of absolution at Corinth.

> To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also. — 2 *Cor.* ii. 10.

42. *Q.* Does any other Apostle speak as if this were the intention of Christ?

A. Yes. St. James bids him who is sick send for the elders of the Church that he may obtain the benefit of absolution.

> If he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him. — *S. James* v. 15.

43. *Q.* Did persons make confession of their sins, though not sick?

A. Yes. We read of a great revival movement of the Spirit at Ephesus, when St. Paul preached what might be called a mission there.

> Many that believed came, and confessed, and shewed their deeds. — *Acts* xix. 18.

44. *Q.* Does the promise of absolution through the ministry of the Church last to the present day?

A. Yes. It is ever needed and so ever lasts.

> The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. — *Acts* ii. 39.

45. *Q.* Who are the successors now living of the Apostles?

A. The Bishops, called in Holy Scripture the Angels of the Churches. (Rev. i. 20.) The Angel signifies God's Messenger and Representative.

46. *Q.* Is the power of absolution confined to the Bishops, or can any other order of the ministry absolve?

A. All priests can absolve.

> He hath given power and commandment to His ministers to pronounce Absolution. — *Book of Common Prayer.*

47. *Q.* How is this?

A. Because the Bishops admit them to this part of their office, and they receive the Holy Ghost and authority to convey Christ's pardon to penitent men.

48. *Q.* When does a priest receive the power of forgiving sins?

A. At his ordination.

> "The Bishop saying, Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." — *The Form of Ordering Priests, Book of Common Prayer.*

49. *Q.* Can we be sure that this power is given at ordination, now that the priesthood no longer possess the power of working miracles?

A. The power of absolution is not dependent on the power of working miracles.

> There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. — 1 *Cor.* xii. 4.

50. *Q.* But was not the power of working miracles promised to the priesthood by Christ, as much as the power of forgiving sins?

A. No. The power of working miracles was not promised to the priesthood as part of their office; but it was promised to *all Christians* in proportion to their *faith.*

> These signs shall follow them that believe. — *S. Mark* xvi. 17.

51. *Q.* Are we then to regard our Lord Jesus Christ acting through His Ministry as being Himself the unseen absolver?

A. It is by virtue of His High Priesthood that we obtain absolution; but the third Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Spirit of Christ, gives it to us, since He dwells with the priesthood for that purpose.

> I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. — *S. John* xiv. 16, 17.

52. *Q.* Are all the official acts of the priesthood done by the power of the Holy Ghost?

A. Yes. The acts of Baptism, Confirmation, Absolution, Ordination, Consecration, Blessing, are all done by the aid of the Holy Spirit.

> By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. — 1 *Cor.* xii. 13.

53. *Q*. What name is given to the Christian priesthood on this account?

A. The Ministry of the Spirit. The descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles enabled them to do those things for which they were previously commissioned.

> Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the Spirit. — 2 *Cor.* iii. 6.

54. *Q*. What is the first means for the remission of sin?

A. Baptism.

> Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. — *Acts* ii. 38.

55. *Q*. What sins are remitted in Baptism?

A. All sin of the previous condition, both original and actual.

> He that lacketh these things is blind and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. — 2 *Pet.* i. 9.

56. *Q*. Are our sins remitted by repentance and faith at conversion?

A. No, for Saul was converted on his way to

Damascus, but his sins were not washed away until his subsequent Baptism.

> Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the Name of the Lord. — *Acts* xxii. 16.

57. *Q.* Why is Baptism, and no other means of forgiveness, mentioned in what we call the Nicene Creed?

A. Because Baptism is the foundation of all subsequent ministry of pardon.

58. *Q.* How often can we receive Baptism?

A. Only once.

> One Lord, one faith, one baptism. — *Eph.* iv. 5.

59. *Q.* May not the grace of Baptism be entirely forfeited?

A. Yes.

> It is impossible for those who were once enlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance. — *Heb.* vi. 4–6.

60. *Q.* Can any one then be reconciled to God if he falls into sin after Baptism?

A. Yes.

> Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. — *Gal.* vi. 1.

61. *Q.* Who are meant by "ye that are spiritual"?

A. The Priesthood. The phrase applies to those

who have received the Holy Spirit for the work of the ministry.

He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? — *Gal.* iii. 5.

62. *Q.* How then should we seek for remission of sins after Baptism?

A. By repentance.

Repent, and do the first works. — *Rev.* ii. 5.

63. *Q.* What are the parts of repentance?

A. 1. Contrition; —

A broken and contrite heart, O God, shalt Thou not despise. — *Ps.* li. 17.

2. Confession; —

He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy. — *Prov.* xxviii. 13.

3. Amendment of life; —

Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first work. — *Rev.* ii. 5.

64. *Q.* What is contrition?

A. A hearty sorrow for having offended God, joined to an earnest determination to avoid sin for the future.

I acknowledge my faults, and my sin is ever before me. Against Thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight: that Thou mightest be justified in Thy saying, and clear when Thou art judged. — *Ps.* li. 3, 4.

65. *Q.* Does contrition require some outward act as a sign of its reality?

A. Yes. St. Paul speaks of the Corinthians showing their contrition by their conduct.

> For behold ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge. — 2 *Cor.* vii. 11.

66. *Q.* When is confession required?

A. When we have committed any mortal or greater sin.

> My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto Him; and tell me now what thou hast done; hide it not from me. — *Josh.* vii. 19.

67. *Q.* Is it not enough to confess to God?

A. Not always.

> Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. — *S. James* v. 16.

68. *Q.* When should we confess our sins?

A. When we need the benefit of absolution. See exhortation to attend Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer (English Edition).

> "And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me,

to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice; to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

69. *Q.* Ought any one to have a quiet conscience after committing sin?

A. No; not unless he knows it has been forgiven.

There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked. — *Is.* lvii. 21.

70. *Q.* But has not our Lord promised to receive every sinner upon his faith and repentance? Has He not offered an assurance of forgiveness upon those conditions?

A. He has made most wide promises, and on the freest terms, assuring all of a welcome and acceptance without money and without price. But it is a rule of construction that all general statements and promises must be governed by particular ones. He offers generally absolution to all penitents, but He particularizes how the absolution may be obtained. Baptism is the first means. Faith and repentance do not convey pardon. They are conditions on which pardon is given. Saul manifested his faith and repentance on the Damascus roadway, but he was not pardoned till Ananias came and said: "Brother Saul, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sin." If faith and repentance alone do not secure pardon for sins before Baptism, neither can they for sins after Baptism.

And as no man can baptize himself, so no man can be his own absolver.

> They have forsaken Me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water. — *Jer.* ii. 13.

71. *Q.* To what do those ministers expose themselves, who, ignoring Christ's modes of absolution, try to lead their people, as the carnal mind is prone, into a state of peace, without using them, and by resting on their inward feelings alone?

A. They dishonour the great principle of the Incarnation, that now God bestows His spiritual blessings through ordained instrumentalities. The Church is the life-giving organism by which men are incorporated into Christ and made partakers of the Divine Nature. Her various ministrations and sacraments are the instrumental means by which grace is communicated to the soul and union with Christ preserved. Wilfully to neglect any of them is to do it at a risk and spiritual loss.

> Because, even because, they have seduced my people saying Peace; and there *was* no peace. — *Ezek.* xiii. 10.

72. *Q.* What is absolution?

A. The forgiveness of sins by the ministry of a priest.

73. *Q.* Is absolution an assurance that sins will be forgiven on the day of judgment?

A. It is an assurance that they will be remem-

bered no more against us if we persevere in a state of penitence.

> Toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in His goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. — *Rom.* xi. 22.

74. *Q.* What do you mean then by the forgiveness of sins?

A. I mean an act of the Holy Ghost upon the soul of the penitent by which he is cleansed and restored to the full favour of God, being clothed with the righteousness of Christ; and this grace is dispensed by the authority of the priest as Christ's representative.

> Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord. — *Eph.* v. 8.

75. *Q.* What are the benefits attendant upon this present reconciliation?

A. They are manifold, chiefly three: —

1. Restoration to all the privileges of Christ's Body;

2. Joy in the assurance of God's love;

3. Strength to overcome habits of sin by the renewal of the Holy Ghost.

76. *Q.* What do you mean by restoration to all the privileges of Christ's body?

A. I mean that we hereby receive authority to approach God in prayer and all the ordinances of grace, and especially in Holy Communion, "with a quiet conscience," knowing that henceforth our sins are no barrier to the full work of grace in our soul.

To the praise of the glory of His Grace wherein He hath made us accepted in the Beloved. — *Eph.* i. 6.

77. *Q.* What do you mean by joy in the assurance of God's love?

A. I mean that the assurance of God's love, thus consigned to us by God's representative, cheers the heart with the oil of gladness, which belongs to God's true children by virtue of His covenant.

For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. — *Rom.* xiv. 17.

78. *Q.* What do you mean by strength to overcome habits of sin by the renewal of the Holy Ghost?

A. I mean that we are not only judicially cleared from the guilt of past sin, but that we are also loosed in a supernatural manner from the bondage of those habits of sin which had kept us enchained. The experience of many testifies that they have thus received grace to overcome habits of sin against which they had for a long time previously struggled in vain.

Being made free from sin and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. — *Rom.* vi. 22.

79. *Q.* Has our Lord given any remarkable illustration of the sinner being released first from the death of sin, and then from the bondage of evil habits?

A. Yes. When our Lord had given life to

Lazarus He bade His attendants remove the grave-clothes from him.

> Jesus saith unto them, Loose him and let him go. — *S. John* xi. 44.

80. *Q.* What other illustrations has God given of His power to restore the soul to its former state?

A. I have blotted out thy transgressions and as a cloud thy sins (Is. xliv. 22). Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow, though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool (Is. i. 18). I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpillar and the palmer worm, and ye shall eat in plenty (Joel ii. 25).

> Then I went down to the potter's house, and behold the vessel that he made of clay was marred. So he made it again another vessel. And the Word of the Lord came to me, saying, O House of Israel cannot I do (so) with you? As the clay is in the potter's hand so are ye in My Hand. — *Jer.* xviii. 6.

81. *Q.* Can any sin, however great, be absolved by the priest?

A. Yes, if only the penitent confesses it with contrition.

> The Blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin. — 1 *S. John* i. 7.

82. *Q.* What are the conditions required of persons who come to seek for absolution?

A. The same which are required of them who come to be baptized, viz., Repentance, whereby

they forsake sin; and Faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament. — *Church Catechism.*

83. *Q.* May not the want of faith, prayer, and the like qualifications make the priest incapable of giving absolution?

A. No; for in ministering this ordinance, as in all other sacramental acts, he is not acting of his own will, nor seeking something for himself, but is merely carrying out the purpose of Christ as the Head of the Church, wherein he is ordained.

> Neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase. — 1 *Cor.* iii. 7.

84. *Q.* Can a priest give or refuse absolution at his pleasure?

A. No. He must give it to those who are truly penitent, and refuse it to those who are not.

> I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality. — 1 *Tim.* v. 21.

85. *Q.* Would it not be enough to trust in the general promises of God's mercy for forgiveness?

A. No; it is not safe to trust in the general promises of God's mercy if we neglect the special means for obtaining forgiveness which He has appointed. A loving penitence is content with nothing less than all the means of cleansing Christ has provided. His petition is, "Wash me thoroughly from my wickedness" (Ps. 51).

86. *Q.* Do any receive pardon by the Church's absolution who have not received it before?

A. Yes; for sometimes an imperfect contrition becomes perfected by this very ordinance. The sorrow deepens as we draw nearer to Christ.

> There is a shame which is glory and grace. — *Ecclus.* iv. 21.

87. *Q.* What other benefits are connected with confession to God in the presence of His representative?

A. Since God has become Incarnate and our sins are against the man Christ Jesus, confession to one who represents Him gives the loving heart an opportunity to make an act of acknowledgment and reparation like unto the personal character of the offence.

> And behold a woman in the city, which was a sinner when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabastar box of ointment, and stood at His Feet behind Him weeping, and began to wash His Feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed His feet and anointed them with ointment. And Jesus said her sins which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much. — *S. Luke* vii. 37.

88. *Q.* Does absolution bring any special blessing to the soul, which contrition alone would not ordinarily bring?

A. Yes. Contrition may obtain for us forgiveness, but absolution brings assurance of pardon and the gift of peace. After Jesus had said, "Thy

sins are forgiven," He added: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in Peace" (St. Luke vii. 50).

89. *Q.* Of what further benefits does absolution assure us?

A. It formally restores us, if we have fallen into any mortal sin, into our former baptismal estate as the child of God, gives back to the soul its supernatural life; it reclothes it with the righteousness of Christ, it renews all the merits of our good works which by mortal sin and alienation from God have been forfeited, on his open acknowledgment of his sin and repentance.

> The Father said bring forth the best robe and put it on him: and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet: and bring hither the fatted calf and kill it; and let us eat and be merry. For this my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found. — *S. Luke* xv. 22.

90. *Q.* Does absolution aid the soul in other ways that contrition by itself cannot aid it?

A. Yes. Perfect contrition brings forgiveness, but the grace of absolution brings light into the soul for the discovering of its faults, fortifies the soul against temptation, strengthens it against its failings and besetting sin. It helps to break the power of self-love and fills the soul with fresh courage, peace, and joy.

> S. Peter was melted into true contrition by the look of Jesus. He was restored and secured a wonderful increment of grace by Christ's absolving words. Feed my lambs, tend my sheep. — *S. John* xxi. 15, 16.

91. *Q.* Does it not weaken the soul, leading it to depend on another, to resort, save in exceptional cases, to priestly guidance and absolution?

A. No. The objection comes from those who do not practice regular confession. A good director trains a soul in spiritual discernment in order that it may see for itself the path of duty, and to depend on God only, for its help.

> Every purpose is established by counsel: and with good advice make war. — *Prov.* xx. 18.
>
> I am the Lord that confirmeth the word of his servant and performeth the counsel of His messengers. — *Is.* xliv. 26.

92. *Q.* Is regular confession helpful to the spiritual life?

A. It has been found so by a great number of saintly members of the Church, both men and women. It has been found to be not medicine for the sick only, but health-food for the convalescent, and that is all the saints are. Our lamps need not only filling, but regular trimming.

> Then all those (wise) virgins arose and trimmed their lamps. — *S. Matt.* xxv. 7.

93. *Q.* How does the Church of Christ regard the priestly office?

A. She has regarded it as the extension of our Lord's Good Samaritan and Good Shepherd work.

> Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief. — *Heb.* xiii. 17.

94. *Q.* Does our Lord love to have His children resort to this means of grace?

A. Yes. Nothing gives Him more delight. Did He limit His forgiveness to seven times or even seventy times seven? He bought the right to pardon and purify by the shedding of His Blood, and is never weary of applying it. He loves to wash again and again the feet of His disciples perpetually being soiled with the dust of earth, taking them up in His own Hands and wiping them with the towel of His Humanity wherewith He is girded. Every fresh absolution is an act of our Lord's love strengthening and beautifying the soul.

> Come unto Me all ye that travail and are heavy laden and I will refresh you. — *S. Matt.* xi. 28.

95. *Q.* Does the Church of England require her clergy at any time specially to move the people to confess their sins?

A. Yes; in the Visitation of the Sick.

> "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter." — *Rubric in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, Book of Common Prayer.*

96. *Q.* Why should not one then put off confession till just before death?

A. Because one may die suddenly, or without the attendance of a priest, or be unable from sickness to think about the duties of religion.

97. *Q.* Is there no other reason?

A. It is a great disrespect to God to neglect

Him when we are well, and if we do, He may justly forsake us in the hour of death and leave us to die without repentance. — *See* Prov. i. 24–28.

98. *Q.* Does the American Prayer Book anywhere require the priest to move a person to confession?

A. Yes. In the Visitation of Prisoners he is to exhort to a confession, and after confession, to declare the pardoning mercy of God in the form of absolution given in the Communion office.

99. *Q.* What is the form of absolution which the Church of England orders to be used after confession?

A. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

100. *Q.* Are not the public absolutions given in the Daily Prayers, and at Holy Communion, as efficacious for the remission of sins as this special absolution?

A. No. They are for those who are in the Body of Christ; not to reconcile those who by gross sin have cast themselves out of the Body of Christ. Also they have their value as acts of priestly blessing and intercession, but they are not judicial declarations of pardon, nor does the Church intend them to supersede special absolution.

101. *Q.* What, then, should the penitent soul do, who is too humble and wise to trust his own

feelings for his acceptance, but would be assured of Christ's pardon and peace?

A. If not baptized, he should be baptized. If he has been, he should resort to that "fountain opened to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness" (Zech. xiii. 1), and to the sprinkling of the Precious Blood "that cleanseth us from all sin."

102. *Q.* May he resort thither with a firm belief that Christ died for all, and so for him?

A. Yes. Jesus Christ died for all.

He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. — 1 *S. John* ii. 2.

103. *Q.* In what capacity did our Lord die?

A. As the victim bearing the sins of mankind, He reconciled man to God.

Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. — *S. John* i. 29.

104. *Q.* But in what capacity does our Lord plead for us?

A. As our high priest.

An High Priest over the House of God. — *Heb.* x. 21.

105. *Q.* Does He now plead for all alike?

A. No.

I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given Me; for they are Thine. — *S. John* xvii. 9.

106. *Q.* How do we obtain a part in our Lord's present intercession?

A. By admission to the fellowship of His Church.

That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. — 1 *S. John* i. 3.

107. *Q.* Was there any type of this amongst the Jews?

A. Yes. Admission to the privileges of the temple was a type of our admission to the privileges of Christ's members in His Church.

The holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true. — *Heb.* ix. 24.

108. *Q.* What act of the Jewish priests represented absolution?

A. His sprinkling the people with blood from a branch of hyssop.

Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean. — *Ps.* li. 7.

109. *Q.* Did this convey forgiveness of sins?

A. No.

It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. — *Heb.* x. 4.

110. *Q.* What, then, was the purpose of it?

A. Besides its immediate purpose as part of the law, it presignified our sprinkling with the Blood of Jesus.

If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the Blood of Christ, Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? — *Heb.* ix. 13, 14.

111. *Q.* Are we then to regard the Jewish temple as a figure of the Christian Church?

A. Yes. The Church is the Body of Christ, and Christ calls His Body a temple.

> He spake of the temple of His Body. — *S. John* ii. 21.

112. *Q.* Must we then be gathered into the privileges of this Temple, if we would have our sins forgiven?

A. Yes.

> And hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son: in Whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins. — *Col.* i. 13–14.

113. *Q.* But if, by post-baptismal sin we have cut ourselves off from these privileges, how can they be regained and our souls reunited by grace to Christ?

A. If persons have been excommunicated, they must be openly restored by "Penance" (Article XXXIII.); if they have cut themselves off by sin, they are formally reconciled by Absolution.

114. *Q.* What does Christ, speaking by His Holy Spirit through His Church, say to your soul to-day?

A. "The Spirit and the Bride say Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. Behold, now is the accepted time; Behold now is the day of salvation."

CONFESSION

CONFESSION IN HOLY SCRIPTURE

1. IN Old Testament times, Confession was made to God in the presence of the Priest. Lev. v. 5; Num. v. 7.

Ecclu. iv. 21: "There is a shame that bringeth sin, and there is a shame which is glory and grace."

Ecclu. iv., 26: "Be not ashamed to confess thy sin."

David confessed to Nathan. 2 Sam. xii. 13: "And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David, the Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die."

Achan confessed to Joshua. Joshua vii. 19: 20: "Joshua said, My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the God of Israel and make confession unto Him and tell me what thou hast done; hide it not from me. And Achan answered Joshua and said, Indeed I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and thus and thus have I done."

2. In New Testament times, people confessed to S. John the Baptist. St. Mark i. 5: "Were all baptized in the river Jordan, confessing their sins."

3. Christ promised the Ministry of Absolution to His Priests. St. Matt. xviii. 18: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be

bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven."

4. Our Lord gave them authority, He breathed on them and said: St. John xx. 21–23: "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

5. Christ must have deemed this Gift to His Church precious and worth using, for it was His first gift after His Resurrection and for the benefit of all mankind. St. John xx. 19.

6. Recognition of this Ministry of Reconciliation by the Apostles and early Church. 2 Cor. v. 18: "God —, hath given unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation." 2 Cor. v. 19: "God —, hath committed unto us the Word of Reconciliation."

7. Exercises of this Ministry of Reconciliation. It was not by preaching only. The Ephesians confessed to St. Paul: Acts xix. 18: "And many that believe came and confessed and showed their deeds."

St. Paul absolved the penitent Corinthian as acting for Christ. It was an individual application for pardon. II. Cor. ii. 10: "Forgave I it in the Person of Christ."

St. James directs it as a matter of course. It does not require Apostolic wisdom or gifts to know whether a person is penitent. St. James v. 16: "Confess your faults one to another." Commenta-

tors refer this to the Elders just mentioned in verse 14. From the beginning of the Christian Church to the sixteenth century confessions to God in the presence of a priest were made, and by four-fifths of Christians are now. They have realized the blessing of an assured forgiveness of sins committed after baptism as well as for those committed before baptism.

CONFESSION IN THE PRAYER BOOK

1. In Daily Morning Prayer.

(*a*) One sentence is: If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness: 1. St. John i. 9.

(*b*) In the "Declaration of Absolution."

It is a "declaration" not a "bestowal" of Absolution.

(*c*) Six things are told of God's Absolution through His Ministry. (*i*) God hath given "Power" to His ministers to absolve sinners. (*ii*) Not only power but "Commandment" so to do. (*iii*) Not only to "declare" it, as might be done in Sermons or Instructions. But, (*iv*) To "pronounce" it, which is an official, judicial word; a judge pronounces his judgment. (*v*) The "absolution" or "loosing from" the bonds of sin. (*vi*) The "Remission" or "forgiveness" of the sins themselves.

2. In the Nicene Creed. "I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins." If God can and does remit in the Sacrament of Baptism sins committed before Baptism, why is it difficult to believe

that He can and does forgive sins committed since Baptism. His priests are like speaking tubes through which He speaks, saying, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."

3. In the Penitential Office for Lent. In the collect beginning "O Lord, we beseech Thee," "to be absolved" is connected with "who confess." As souls are brought into the Church one by one, so if they fall away, they must be restored one by one.

4. In the Communion Office. (*i*) There is a form for a general Confession by the communicant of past offenses and unworthiness by way of deepening love, followed by a precatory form of absolution and comfortable words. This is for those who are in a state of grace. It does not apply to those who have committed grievous or mortal sins and are not in a state of grace. It is not for the reconciliation of sinners but for the comfort of the faithful.

(*ii*) In the first warning, it is stated that if a person cannot quiet his conscience let him come to a Minister of God's Holy Word and "open his grief," that is, make his confession. Ought one's conscience to be quiet if in mortal sin? A mortal sin is one that is deliberate, and so wilful.

(*iii*) The first part of the same warning speaks of "the great peril of the unworthy receiving" of the Holy Communion. Can you afford to leave unused this divine method of avoiding that peril?

5. In the Visitation of Prisoners. (*i*) A Rubric says: "After his Confession, the Priest shall declare to him the pardoning mercy of God," i.e. give him

Absolution. Must a man have committed a crime worthy of death, before he may have the comfort of a personal absolution?

(*ii*) The form of Absolution in the English Prayer Book in the Visitation of the Sick, is as follows: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power in His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offenses and by His authority committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen."

6. In the Ordination of Priests. The Bishop makes the Priest the instrument of conveying absolution. He says to the Priest, in the act of ordaining him, the following words: "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

The power of absolution is inherent in every priest. The privilege of going to confession is the right of every person.

7. The need in certain cases of resorting to this power is declared in the XXXIII article. Those who have been cut off from the Church must be "reconciled by Penance"; our church uses the term Penance and declares it in some cases necessary.

THEOLOGICAL REASONS FOR ITS USE

1. The use of Penance is only another application of the law of the Incarnation and of all Sacraments, viz.: that God chooses to bestow His spiritual

treasures through outward and visible channels or agencies.

2. As for the body, besides birth, strength, and food, there is provided also cure when sick; so for the soul, besides Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion, there is provided by God Penance (Cure) when sick.

3. Penance like every ordained means of blessing bestows its own special healing, enlightening, invigorating, fortifying grace. One having perfect contrition may be forgiven without Confession, but they lose the grace of absolution.

4. It restores to the soul its supernatural life, which it had lost by mortal sin.

5. It restores all the merits of our good works, which we lost by mortal sins.

6. It gives "absolution," or loosening of the grip of sins and especially of our own besetting sin.

7. Grace received in Penance gives supernatural light to the understanding and fills the soul with fresh courage, peace, and joy.

DEVOTIONAL READINGS

1. Confession is an act of humiliation and self-punishment, and in proportion as we are really sorry for sin, we will welcome it.

2. Confession is an act of reparation for past sins. There are not many ways in which we can make discreet acts of reparation; but Confession is the divinely appointed one, which to our Lord is dear.

3. The forcing oneself to go to one's Confession

is an exercise and development of will-power in behalf of God and our own soul; a practice greatly needed in these days of softness and self-indulgence.

4. It affords a frequent opportunity to make a new beginning in our struggle against sin, and to make fresh starts in the spiritual life, which is the rule of progress with the Saints.

5. It gives your Spiritual Guide a chance of aiding you in self-conquest and in the development of your spiritual llfe. He will not in deciding questions lead you to rely on him, but train you how to decide for yourself.

6. It is the Sacrament of the Compassion of Jesus. "In the Holy Eucharist, Jesus is reigning among the just; in Penance, Jesus is seeking among sinners for those that are lost."

7. Coming into the presence of Jesus and the very consciousness of being forgiven by Him helps to deepen contrition and love.

8. Every sin is not only against God, but also against the Church. So acknowledgment should be made not only to God, but to the Church, which is represented by the Priest.

9. Before the Incarnation men sinned against the invisible God and could make their confessions mostly in private. Now we have sinned against the Incarnate Lord, and honor demands we should make an act of reparation to Him and the person of His representative.

PRACTICAL REASONS

1. Unless you tell your sins to your Pastor, he cannot intelligently advise you.

2. After your Confession, you hear the words spoken which bring to you God's Absolution; and this is the only way in which you can have that joy.

3. Your Confession is made now that your soul may be cleansed of sin, so that you may not fear the inevitable Confession at the Last Day.

4. If you make your confession, you know you are not leaving unused at least this Means of Grace which the dear Lord has provided for your soul.

5. Christ instituted this Sacrament with words of peace (St. John xx. 19), and it does bring very calming peace to those who use it.

6. It is always painful to apologize, but a noble nature is never satisfied until it has thus made amends for the wrong it has done. Confession is one way (and apparently the only practicable way) of making an apology to God for our sins.

7. The Priest is bound, under pain of most grievous mortal sin, never to reveal anything told to him in Confession. Neither can he act on anything so revealed to him nor even allude out of Confession, to the penitent, to anything said in Confession.

8. You can go to what priest you choose. Have you never felt, "If only I could share with some one, whom I could trust, the needs of my soul, and get as I can from my physician or lawyer unbiased or friendly advice?"

9. Self-examination is necessary to our knowledge of our spiritual condition, but this is rarely done so regularly or fully as by those who go to confession.

10. Confession is a constant check upon sin. For it helps us to keep Jesus in mind. He becomes more personal to us. We are seeking to be less unworthy of His love. We become more careful lest we offend Him.

V

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

FOR fifteen hundred years it was generally acknowledged that the Christian ministry, instituted by Christ and His Apostles, was preserved and transmitted by Episcopal ordination. Many learned Protestants, like Grotius and others, have stated this as a well-acknowledged fact. "There is," said Dr. Jablowsky, a learned Protestant, "no doctrine or tenet of the Christian religion in which all Christians for the space of fifteen hundred years have so unanimously agreed as in this of Episcopacy. In all ages and times, down from the Apostles, and in all places through Europe, Asia and Africa, whereever there were Christians there were likewise Bishops, and even where Christians differed in other points of doctrine or custom, and made schisms or divisions in the Church, yet did they all remain unanimous in this, in retaining their Bishops."[1]

The first actual departure from the Christian ministry, as constituted under Bishops, was by the Lutherans at the Reformation. The Augsburg Confession (1530), nevertheless, expressed reverence for it and a desire to retain it.

The necessity of going on without Bishops was regarded by some of the leaders, like Melancthon, as

[1] Newcome's *Life of Archbishop Sharp*, Vol. ii., p. 187.

something temporary. At first some clergy were chosen to act as Superintendents. "That the Superintendents appointed (says Mr. Gladstone) were designed to replace the Bishops appears to be erroneous. They were officers appointed to prevent the lapse of one particular function, viz., the ordinary oversight of visitation of the clergy, and thus, in part, supply the need which the refusal of the Bishops generally to countenance the measures of the Reformation had created."[1]

The Calvinists also did not willingly part with Episcopacy. Calvin declared of Episcopacy, "that the man was worthy of anathema who should not reverence it and with the utmost deference receive it,[2] and "desired the introduction of Episcopacy into the Reformation Churches abroad."[3]

Wesley, in his celebrated "Korah" sermon, scathingly censured those who would depart from the Apostolic order, and Dr. Coke, one of the first Superintendents, as they were then called, of the Methodists in this country, made proposals to Bishops White[4] and Seabury, that he and Mr. Asbury (the resident Methodist Superintendent) should be consecrated Bishops, and proposed a reunion of Methodists and Churchmen on a basis conceding a reordination of their ministers.

[1] Gladstone, *The State in its Relations with the Church*, Vol. ii., pp. 86–88, Fourth Edition.

[2] Calvin's tract, *De necessitate, reformandæ ecclesiæ.* Cited by Strype, *Life of Archbishop Parker*, pp. 69, 70.

[3] Toplady, Vol. ii., p. 153.

[4] *Bishop White's Memoirs*, pp. 424–9.

But the reasons of necessity or expediency, by which men might justify to themselves a temporary departure from the received order of Church government, would not justify a perpetual separation from the acknowledged successors of the Apostles, and naturally the followers of Luther and Calvin, as in later times those of Wesley, were forced to devise some arguments from Scripture or antiquity to make Episcopal succession and ordination, which they could not have, appear unnecessary. Arguments intended to meet the exigencies of an enforced position in morals, or politics, or theology, are not patient of a very vigorous investigation, but often may be stated with sufficient plausibility to successfully recommend an otherwise popular cause. And so it has come to pass that what was once with practical unanimity and for about fifteen hundred years recognized as the Divinely-ordained plan for perpetuating the Christian ministry has, especially in our own country, become obscured.

The majority have eyes and ears only for the utterances of the little local majority about them. They do not try to hear the testimony that comes with awful voice through all the ages, and utters itself through a vast preponderating multitude of Christians. Or they take refuge in the truism that majorities are not always in the right, forgetting that while this is true in all other matters, yet it is not true in respect of Christian doctrine. For if Christ is a Divine Teacher He could not have so badly taught His doctrines as that the greater number of His fol-

lowers throughout all time should go wrong. No opinion concerning politics or philosophy is proved to be right because there is a majority in its favor, but a preponderating majority of Christians in all ages, agreeing in any article of faith, bears witness to the fact that the doctrine or practice so universally and continuously held had Christ as its Author.

Some Christians, finding much spiritual profit in what they possess of Christ's gifts, rest satisfied without inquiring whether, under the Apostolic order of the Episcopacy, they might not possess fuller gifts of grace and please the Divine Master by a still closer union with Him. Or, if they do inquire, it is not infrequently with an inherited sectarian prejudice against the Episcopal Church, much like that of Nathaniel against Nazareth, and unlike Nathaniel in laying aside these prejudices so far as to "come and see," they begin by demanding such absolute proof of Episcopacy from Scripture as shall exclude every other hypothesis, and so compel their assent.

Under happier circumstances, before differences among Christians had hardened into sects, ere zeal for God's service had soured into party spirit and eagerness for victory biassed the honest search for truth, Christians would have studied the Scriptures in another spirit and method. They would not have demanded such proof as Scripture does not purport to give to any doctrine. They would have studied the Bible to see if, by a fair construction, the universal form of Church government, such as Episcopacy must be admitted to have been for fifteen hundred

years,[1] was to be found in those writings, which were generally received as the holy and inspired writings of the Christian Church. If the testimony of the two witnesses of Divine Faith, the Living Church and the written Word, were found capable of a harmonious construction, such agreement would amount to a moral demonstration, and be a practical guide for a Christian's conduct. This moral certainty would suffice him.

If, then, there exists on earth an order of Christian ministers, who, by a direct transmission of authority from Him and His Apostles, are Christ's ambassadors, representatives, stewards of His gifts, a ministry so appointed and preserved must have some benefits to bestow peculiar to itself. Every good and well-disposed truth-seeker will admit this. If there is sufficient evidence in Holy Scripture, in concurrence with the fact of the existence of the Episcopate from such early times[2] as even opponents grant, to render this probable, it is the part of practical wisdom to avail one's self of its advantages and blessings.

Let us then examine Holy Scripture and see if such evidence exists. The subject will be better understood if divided into two parts, viz., The Formation of the Apostolic Order and the Development of the Christian Ministry.

[1] LeMoyne, Divinity Professor at Leyden. Cited in *Hobart's Apology*, p. 96. — "For the space of fifteen hundred years all the other churches of the world had no other kind of government."

[2] Lightfoot, *Ep. to Philippians. Dis. on Christian Ministry*, pp. 184, 225.

I

The Formation of the Apostolic Order

The Christian Ministry is the work of God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Father sent the Son. Christ was God's Apostle.[1] Yet by His own Will the Eternal Word or Wisdom came.[2] He took our nature into union with His own. The Word was made Flesh.[3] The Link which united the two was His Personality. He thus became our Mediator.[4] His work was to effect man's at-one-ment with God.[5] The office it involved was to be creation's Prophet,[6] Priest[7] and King.[8] He took not on Himself this office, though so qualified for it.[9] He was certified [10] and consecrated [11] and empowered for its fulfilment. He was not instituted into an office like an earthly one, to which certain powers are attached. He became the Anointed, the Christ, by receiving the indwelling Gift of the Holy Spirit.[12] Thus sent, called, consecrated, did the Son of God, manifest in the flesh, become our High Priest, our Prophet and King, the Bishop of our souls.[13]

Consider next the action of the Son in forming the Christian ministry. First He called some to it. He called many to follow Him, but He gave some a double call. He called these to leave their nets and

[1] Heb. iii. 1.
[2] Ps. xl. 7, 8.
[3] St. John i. 14.
[4] I. Tim. ii. 5.
[5] Rom. v. 11.
[6] Acts iii. 22.
[7] Heb. iii. 1.
[8] St. John xviii. 37.
[9] Heb. v. 5.
[10] St. John i. 33.
[11] St. Matt. iii. 16, 17.
[12] St. John iii. 34.
[13] I. St. Pet. ii. 25.

publican's tables and be His disciples, and then He called them again after prayer and chose them to be His Apostles.[1] His next work in forming His ministry is to gather them into union with His own threefold office.[2] Precisely how He did this is seen by noting the three great divisions of His Life: His Public, His Suffering, and His Risen Life. His public life begins with His Baptism at Jordan, His suffering life with the entry into Jerusalem, His risen with His Resurrection. Each has its distinctive feature. In His public life it is His prophetical office; in His suffering, His priestly; in His risen, His kingly. When He was Himself publicly exercising His Prophetical office, He "gave unto them to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven,"[3] and said, "go and preach." When He was especially fulfilling His Priestly work and about to offer Himself upon the Cross, He made the Apostles one with Himself by feeding on the Sacrifice, and commanded them to offer that Eucharistic Sacrifice which was to show forth His death until His coming again, saying, "Do this," *i.e.*, "Offer this for a Memorial of Me."[4] When He stood before them in

[1] St. Luke vi. 12, 13. [2] St. Matt. x. 40. [3] St. Matt. xiii. 11; x. 7.

[4] St. Luke xxii. 19. The word "do" (ποιεῖτε), here means offer. The same word is used in Lev. ix. 7: "Go unto the Altar and offer (ποίησον), thy sin offering." In this sense it is used in some seventy places in Scripture.

The word "remembrance" (ἀνάμνησιν) signifies a Memorial to be made before God. This is witnessed to for Churchmen, by the words of the Book of Common Prayer. In the Communion Service, after the words of institution said over the elements, the priest must say: "Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy Dearly Beloved Son, Jesus Christ, we do celebrate and

the power of His victory over death and hell, as the Victor King He gave them authority to admit men into the kingdom by baptism, and to minister the kingly function of forgiveness and reconciliation, saying: "Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted." [1] They were thus to be united to His kingly power, "Sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

The third step in the process of the ministerial formation was to make them sharers of His own world-wide jurisdiction. So He gave them mission and jurisdiction, saying: "All power is given unto Me," "Go ye teach all nations." [2] Where two or three disciples were gathered together in His Name (*i.e.*, baptized into His Name), He declared that He would be in the midst of them, to Whom by baptism they were united; but more than this, He promised to His Apostles His abiding Presence and co-operating power, saying, "Lo, I am with you alway, unto the end of the world." [3]

Lastly, there remains the fourth stage of Christ's work in forming His Apostolic order. They had been called and commissioned as representative

make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy Holy Gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, The Memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make."

The English fails to convey to us the meaning of these words "do" and "remembrance." They were words in common use, in a liturgical and sacrificial sense, when spoken by our Lord, and so would have been understood by the Apostles. See all the instances of the words' use in Scripture in Bishop Hamilton's charge.

[1] St. John xx. 23.

[2] St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19.

[3] St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

prophets, priests and kings of Jesus Christ. If they were only to have filled an office like any earthly one, to which certain powers or prerogatives belonged, this would have sufficed. But theirs was not merely an office; it was a work which required that its minister should have an abiding gift in himself for its performance. So, as Christ Himself was consecrated our Prophet, Priest and King by the Father, and received the Holy Ghost for His office, did they also need to be consecrated and receive the Holy Ghost to be His representatives. Christ Who, Himself, had washed their feet[1] as a token of their priesthood and right as priests to enter His temple, and breathed upon them[2] as symbolizing the kingly reconciling power which by their own lips they should minister, completes His work and gift of "actual" grace by their consecration. At Pentecost the Holy Ghost descends to *dwell within* them.[3]

This brings us to the consideration of the work of the Holy Ghost in the formation of the Christian ministry.

The Lord Christ has called men to be His followers and some of them to be His Apostles. The latter He had united to His own priestly, prophetical and kingly office, and made them sharers of His victory by bestowing on them a world-wide jurisdiction; but yet the Church and ministry lay like the body of Adam, in all the perfection of form and of natural powers, unable to fulfil its supernatural work until

[1] St. John xiii. 5.
[2] St. John xx. 22.
[3] Acts ii. 3, 4. Rom. i. 4, 5.

in it, as in Adam, the Holy Spirit should take up His abode. Christ baptized the Church with fire and the Holy Ghost.[1] The Holy Spirit enters into her. What does He do with regard to the ministry?

As God the Father is Source and Origin; and God the Son, the Eternal Wisdom, orders all created things; God the Holy Ghost makes them living. Action is His characteristic. He, by action, perfects.

He comes to dwell in the ministry and perfects it in three ways, viz., enabling, uniting and completing it.

By the indwelling Spirit the Apostles became *able* ministers of the word.[2] He enabled them to fulfil their office and work. This He has done from the first and is still doing. He enabled them to teach authoritatively;[3] to celebrate the Eucharist;[4] to ordain and to rule.[5] But of this portion of His work the subject does not call for comment.

The Holy Spirit *united* the ministry, formed by Christ as we have seen, to Christ.[6] The bond of union is a perpetual and living Bond, for It is the Spirit Himself.[7] This was done on the day of Pentecost.

The Holy Spirit *perfects* the ministry, so constituted, by completing it.

Now the uniting and perfecting operation of the Spirit in forming the Christian ministry has a twofold basis. The first is the Presence of Christ in His Church. Christ has not gone away, as the popular

[1] St. Matt. iii. 11. [4] I. Cor. x. 16; Rom. xv. 15, 16.
[2] II. Cor. iii. 6. [5] Acts xv. 28; Titus i, 5. [6] Acts iv. 29, 30.
[3] St. John xiv. 26; xvi. 13; I. Cor. ii. 12, 13, 16. [7] St. John xvi. 14, 15.

theology represents Him, from this earth to some distant star. He is at the right hand of God the Father. The Father hath received Him. A cloud hides Him from our sight. But He is still with us, His members. "Lo, I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you." He not only sends, He comes Himself.[1] Thus the Spirit does not come to take the place of an absent Lord, but to make Christ, manifesting Himself in different ways and degrees, in His members, in the ministry, in the Sacraments, everywhere present in His Church.

The second basic truth is that the Holy Spirit is not an influence or grace dwelling in the Apostles to help them as they might use it, but He is a Person acting in them and to Whom they are to be subordinate.

The presence of these two Personal Factors is witnessed by the cases of the consecration of St. Matthias,[2] elected before the day of Pentecost, and that of St. Paul and St. Barnabas,[3] the first consecration to the Apostolate after Pentecost.

These cases seem to have been ordained, in every particular, one before and one after Pentecost, for the purpose of declaring these truths — the Presence of Christ and the Personality of the Spirit.

The case of Matthias is full of instruction. One of the Apostles, Judas, had fallen away. It would obviously have marred the symmetry of our Lord's progressive action in the formation of His ministry

[1] See Newman's Par. Sermon, *The Spiritual Presence of Christ in His Church.* [2] Acts i. 23–26. [3] Acts xiii. 1–4.

and the teaching involved in it, if He Himself had called a new Apostle during the Resurrection period of the forty days. He might most fittingly restore, in this kingly period of His action, one fallen like St. Peter to his former place,[1] but not begin at this time the process of identification with His prophetical and priestly offices. If, then, the call was not to be made at this time by Christ, by whom and how was it to be done?

There was a further difficulty, during the ten days between the Ascension and Pentecost, for the powers of the Apostles were then limited. They were not yet consecrated. They could not call persons into fellowship with themselves, as, after having received the Pentecostal gift, they did. Still less could they lay hands and give the Holy Ghost, for the Holy Spirit as a Person had not yet come to dwell within them.

Had St. Peter been the Vicar of Christ he might have made the selection, but as he was not, all that the Apostles could do was to pray that the Lord would designate the proper person for the office. And since Christ was not yet dwelling in His Church, they could only obtain answer, concerning which of two was to be taken, from the yet silent Christ, in the silent way of determination by lot.[2] It was something which had not again to be repeated. Being thus designated and chosen to the Apostolic order, the definition of whose powers had been completed by Christ immediately before His Ascension, St.

[1] St. John xxi. 15–17. [2] Acts i. 26.

Matthias had but to be consecrated, as he was, along with the eleven, on the day of Pentecost. He thus became an Apostle equal to the others.

After Pentecost the condition of things is changed. Then Christ is present in His Church, and the Holy Spirit, Who is a Person, dwells within her. These two great truths are shown (in contrast with the call and consecration of St. Matthias) by the call and consecration of St. Paul and St. Barnabas. See how the latter case, for it is but one, does this.

The truth revealed by Christ was not, in its practical application, all at once realized by the Apostles. Into this Truth (not at first comprehended by the twelve), the Holy Spirit came according to Christ's promise to guide them. They were, for example, to realize that the Gentile and Jew were to be alike free from the law and every way on an equality; that Christ's second coming was not immediately impending; that the Kingdom of Christ was to be established throughout the world; that consequently the extension of the ministry, not as a witness of the resurrection, but as ministering the powers and gifts of Christ's three great offices to other generations, was a necessity. They were to learn that the promise of Christ that He would be with them to the end of the world meant, not that they were to live on unto the world's end, but that they were to have successors who would do so.

Gradually the Holy Spirit leads them into the practical realization of these truths. First, Christ is revealed as dwelling within the Church and continu-

ing His ministry beyond the twelve. Therefore it is that the Lord now visibly appears and meets Saul on His way to Damascus. He appears to him not afar off, as St. Stephen saw Him when the heavens were opened, standing on the right hand of God,[1] but meets him right in the road and in the way, as very close to him; so close that while Saul heard the words Christ spoke, those who accompanied him heard the voice[2] but not the words.[3] Christ thus appeared and spoke to Saul, and then and there called, commissioned, and sent him, as He had done the Apostles *before* Pentecost, to be His Apostle.[4]

But though thus commissioned by Christ Himself, even as the Apostles were, and though Paul has received supernatural revelations from heaven, putting him thus on an equality with the twelve, yet, like them, Paul must be consecrated and receive the special gift of the Holy Ghost required for the office and work of an Apostle. How shall this be obtained?

The Spirit has already descended. He is never spoken of after Pentecost as again coming down *from heaven*. He may "fall" on the first Gentile candidates for Christian baptism,[5] and bestow on them some gifts of "actual" grace, as certifying to St. Peter Christ's predestination of the Gentiles and their fitness for the regenerating grace of baptism. The place may be shaken [6] when the Apostles prayed and gave thanks; but these are but manifestations of the Holy Spirit's abiding Presence in the Church. The

[1] Acts vii. 55, 56.
[2] Acts ix. 5.
[3] Acts xxii. 9.
[4] Acts xxvi. 16, 17.
[5] Acts x. 44.
[6] Acts iv. 31.

Spirit had come, on the day of Pentecost, proceeding from Christ, to abide in His Body the Church.

How then shall Paul and Barnabas receive this gift? Not now by the laying on of the Apostles' hands. Not that they were since Pentecost unable to do this.[1] Forced by necessity to delegate some authority to others, they did so in the case of the seven, whose office developed into that known as the ecclesiastical deacon.[2] But the necessity of providing for the Gentiles by the extension of their own order, to those not witnesses of the resurrection, and who should be equal in spiritual ministrations with themselves, had to be visibly demonstrated and constrainedly forced upon them *by a unique action of the Holy Spirit.* They, who needed a vision and a miraculous gift of tongues to the converts before they would allow a Gentile to be baptized, needed a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost to make them understand the necessity of the extension, beyond their own sacred number, of the Apostolic powers they possessed.

They were to receive an object lesson which should also teach them that, by the laying on of hands, they were not merely thereby "to appoint men over this business,"[3] but to bestow a *grace for the performance of ministerial duties.*

Besides this, the Church was to be guarded against an error into which it might have fallen had it supposed that the grace of ordination was communicated *through* the Apostles and not *by* them. It is,

[1] Acts viii. 17. [2] Acts vi. 6. [3] Acts vi. 3.

even now, a frequent misrepresentation of non-Churchmen that the grace of ordination is supposed to be communicated from one bishop to another by touch of hand. The bishops are not channels through which grace flows. If they were so, the personal unworthiness of the minister in whom, by reason of his sins, grace could not dwell, would invalidate his official acts. Bishops have received by their own ordination a special character, but are not channels of grace. They are authorized agents, to whose laying on of hands with prayer, the gift of grace is pledged. The Church was guarded from the disastrous consequence of the error that the Apostles were depositories and channels of this grace, by their *not being* the consecrators in the first instance of the extension of their powers. Here others act, that into the three truths, viz., the necessary extension of their order — the grace given for its performance — and the manner of its bestowal — the Apostles might be led.

They were, moreover, practically to be taught that the Holy Spirit was not a mere influence or grace, which they were to use as they might deem advisable, as in the case of the creation of an order of needed servants, like that of the first deacons, but that the Holy Spirit was *a Person, Whom they were to obey.*

So it came to pass that "there were in the Church at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; — as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate Me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them,

they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed."[1]

We thus see the moral purpose of others than the Apostles laying on their hands in this first case, and learn from Holy Scripture by Whom it was so ordered. As Christ had formed Apostles, the Holy Ghost had gifted certain persons to be Christian prophets. It was by the agency of these special instruments of the Holy Ghost, in the new dispensation, that Paul and Barnabas were consecrated. Some have supposed that among these prophets were some or one of the Apostles, who might have been a prophet also; others have denied that the transaction at Antioch was a consecration. But, granting it was a consecration, and that there were no Apostles present, the case only more clearly elucidates the conveyance of the necessary gift of grace and the formation of the Apostolic order.

For these further points are to be noted: The laying on of hands for the bestowal of orders may be done only by those who are especially authorized so to do, and no others. The prophets could do so, in this one case to which they were limited, by being specially empowered so to do. Secondly, this peculiar direction of the Spirit belonged to the period of the formation of the Apostolic order. It was a unique work, both in the manner of the Spirit's manifestation and in the time of its occurrence. It was a laying of the foundation of the ministry, and was not to be repeated, any more than Christ's visible

[1] Acts xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4.

work in forming the ministry. The Christian ministry rises after this, "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets."[1] Thirdly, the Spirit's work is ever, and so here, subordinate to Christ's. Therefore, though consecrated Apostles and able to ordain, St. Paul and St. Barnabas must not form an independent line of ministry; they must not continue to exercise their gifts independently of the other Apostles. They must formally be gathered into their fellowship. So they go up "by revelation"[2] to Jerusalem, and when the other Apostles had "seen the grace that was given"[3] unto them, they gave the "right hands of fellowship," and St. Paul and St. Barnabas were "received of the Church, the Apostles and elders"[4] as Apostles[5] to the Gentiles.

The Holy Ghost thus completes and perfects the establishment of the Apostolic order, for the needs of the Church unto the "end of the world." Christ created the order. The Holy Ghost perfects it. He united it to Christ and then quickened it. Christ formed the order. The Holy Ghost made it a *living* order. It was not complete, as an order, until this was done. It is, after this completion of the Apostolic order, that the Apostolic Succession, that is the sequence of the formation of Apostles by Apostles, commences. It was only after the Apostolic order had thus been formed that St. Timothy, pointed out "by prophecy,"[6] is consecrated an Apostle by the laying on of the Apostolic hands[7] of St. Paul.

[1] Eph. ii. 20. [3] Gal. ii. 9. [5] Gal. ii. 8; I. Tim. ii. 7.
[2] Gal. ii. 2. [4] Acts xv. 4. [6] I. Tim. iv. 14. [7] II. Tim. i. 6.

Certain features of this guidance of the Apostles into the truth of their own powers and position and duties may now be clearly discerned.

The Apostolic office is not to be confined to those capable of witnessing to the Resurrection, or to those called by the visible Christ, but embraces others, brought, by the Spirit, into union with Christ, in the fellowship of the Apostolic order, to supply the needs of the Church. The Apostles might not at first have realized this was to be, and the holiest disciple might have shrunk from being so associated with them, but the Holy Spirit, as the living Guide, declared otherwise.

Again, it is seen that the Christian ministry is not like an earthly profession, requiring merely natural powers or virtues for its exercise; or like an earthly office, to which certain powers being attached, an induction into the office clothes one with authority. The Apostles are united to a Divine Person, Who speaks and acts, in all their ministrations, through them. They are not indeed like mechanical instruments acting automatically, but they do not perform their functions by their natural powers alone. They are united to Christ by the indwelling Spirit and, for the performances of their special functions, are empowered by a special grace.

Lastly, the order of Apostles is not to be called "extraordinary" and so "temporary" on account of any special duty of its first members, such as witnessing to the fact of the Resurrection, or from the manner of their calling as by Christ visibly, but is seen to

be permanent and continuous in that its ordinary gifts and ministrations are what all men need. In the incipient, and so extraordinary, action of its formation Christ was visible and the Holy Spirit sensibly present, but in the ordinary action of its growth They are hidden, yet the order extends itself by the same living Powers, of Christ and the Holy Ghost, as gave it being. Both are now hidden, yet the Lips of Christ are ever Living and the Spirit ever acting. He goes on calling, the Spirit consecrating, and, through His established instrumentalities, extending the order whose ordinary, and consequently enduring, work is to minister, in their fulness, the Blessings of Christ's prophetical, priestly and kingly work to mankind.

II

The Development of the Ministry

The Christian ministry is the work of God. He made it and it shares in the adornments bestowed upon His Church. We find these described with more or less fulness in I. Cor. xii, 28; Eph. iv. 7, 8, 11; Romans xii. 6–9. From whence we learn that Christ, when He ascended, gave gifts to men and set some in the Church: first, Apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers, evangelists, pastors.

All these words probably denote gifts, not distinct ranks of Church officers; just as, had it been said God gave statesmen, poets, jurists, scientists, generals, these words would not imply His establishment of

different ranks in the nation's rulers, but gifts to the nation. It will, however, be immaterial if we take the foregoing texts as stating the combined work of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and so the one word "Apostles" to mean the Apostolic order of ministry, and the remaining words only as applying to spiritual endowments. They are elsewhere called gifts of prophecy, inspiration, discerning of mysteries; gifts of teaching, exhortation, governments, helps. These like other gifts of the Spirit, — the gift of healings, the working of miracles, of speaking with tongues, — were exercised largely by the laity as well as the clergy. The miraculous manifestations were not a sign of the ministry, but were signs[1] which "followed them that believe." Revelation and prophecy were not exclusive possessions of Apostles like St. Paul or St. John; Agabus[2] and Ananias[3] had the prophetical insight, and the four daughters of Phillip, virgins, did prophesy.[4] Inspiration was not a distinctive mark of the Apostolic order. St. Luke, who was not an Apostle, wrote one of the Gospels, so also does St. Mark.

Prophecy and teaching were to be exercised subordinately to the faith once delivered, but Aquilla and Priscilla and Apollos, who were not in orders, possess these gifts. The work of exhortation is the work of an evangelist, but the evangelist is not a distinct office in the Church, seeing that both St. Timothy,[5] the Bishop, and St. Philip, the Deacon, were also

[1] St. Mark xvi. 17.
[2] Acts xi. 28.
[3] Acts ix. 10.
[4] Acts xxi. 9.
[5] II. Tim. iv. 5.

evangelists.[1] Moreover, our Lord is called and calls Himself an Apostle, Prophet, Teacher, Evangelist, Pastor or Shepherd.

The numerals, prefixed in the text to the words, denote not ranks in the ministry, but, according to Hooker,[2] the sequence of the gifts. "The Apostles first, because unto them was granted the revelation of all truth from Christ immediately. Secondarily, prophets, because they had of some things knowledge in the same manner. Thirdly, teachers, for what was known to them 'came by hearing.'"

These terms, therefore, do not signify separate orders of the ministry. There are two misconceptions in the sectarian interpretation of these texts, upon which those systems of church government are based. They surmise that here is an exhaustive list of Church offices; some of which, the Apostles, the prophets and the evangelists, were extraordinary and have passed away, and consequently only the two latter, pastors and teachers, remain.

According to Hooker,[3] one error of their interpretation lies in here "surmising incompatible offices where nothing is meant but sundry graces, gifts and abilities which Christ has bestowed." Their other misconception is in supposing that any of these gifts of God have passed away. These gifts might be bestowed singly or together, for temporary or permanent use, in a greater or less degree. They remain in the Church to this day. There are still those who have special gifts of government, of exhortation, of

[1] Acts xxi. 8. [2] Ecc. Pol. v. 78, 8. [3] Ecc. Pol. v. 78, 8.

teaching, of doing the work of an evangelist, of prophetical insight, of special intercourse with God, and signs still follow the humble, hidden prayer of faith.

As the Holy Spirit abides in the Church, and divides these gifts to every man severally as He will, so does the Apostolic order, gathered into union with Christ and made the representative of His threefold office of Prophet, Priest and King, continue unto the world's end. It continues not in consequence of His promise, but according to His promise. It continues because *He* continues with His Church: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the world's end."

Christ, as we have seen, formed the order of the Christian ministry. The Holy Ghost made it a living order. Both together extend it.

The process was a gradual one. Gradually our Lord made His Apostles sharers in His own Mediatorial office, then, by His Spirit, united them to Himself, and, collectively, they became the Representative of their unseen Lord; gradually also does the Apostolic ministry, by the power and guidance of the Spirit, gather others into different degrees of fellowship with itself, and make them proportionally partakers of Christ's powers. Before the last Apostle passes away from his labors, others have been made partakers in all the powers needful for the Church's continuous life, and, along with the completion of the Holy Scriptures, the Church's government, in the form of the three orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, is seen to be established.

We see first that the contentions between the Hellenist and Jewish converts[1] are the providential emergency which lead to the formation of the order of Deacons. They are certainly an established ecclesiastical order when St. Paul, in the year 62, writes his epistle to the Philippians. Paul and Timothy, who were Apostles, salute "all the saints at Philippi, with the bishops" (then the name for the second order in the ministry), "and deacons."[2] The functions proper to the office of this latter class are designated in the epistle to the Corinthians "helps,"[3] in Romans they are included in the category of "ministrations."[4] By their aid the Apostolic order begins the extension of Christ's ministerial, not merely philanthropic, work of going about doing good to the bodies as well as the souls of men. The deacons also preach and baptize. Their name of "server" signifies that their work is subordinate and their authority delegated. It is a name shared with the Apostles, as is elder, the chief name of the second rank of the Christian ministry. It shows they are one with the Apostles, and their authority derived through them. They are chosen by the laity, but are appointed and ordained by the Apostles with prayer and the laying on of hands.

The directions given in the Holy Scripture, concerning the qualifications necessary for admission into the Diaconate,[5] show it to be an established order of the Christian ministry. While the order is an integral and enduring portion of the ministry, the

[1] Acts vi. 1. [2] Phil. i. 1. [3] I. Cor. xii. 28. [4] Rom. xii. 7.
[5] I. Tim. iii. 8–14.

members who compose it, on using the office of a deacon well, "purchase to themselves a good degree." They are capable of advancement to a fuller participation in Christ's office.

This "good degree" was developed in the Church after the same general law of progress. The persecution, which arose about St. Stephen, widely scattered abroad[1] a large body of Christians, and made provision for their spiritual wants necessary. We now read of an order called "Elders."[2] St. Paul and St. Barnabas a few years after, on their first missionary journey, ordain elders in every Church.[3] These are found associated with, but a distinct rank from, the Apostles at Jerusalem.[4] The decree of the first Council runs in the name of the Apostles, and elders (and) brethren.[5] St. Paul sends for the elders from Ephesus to come to him.[6] He gives directions to Titus to ordain elders in Crete.[7]

They were called elders in the Jewish churches, and this seems their more common name, but in the Gentile churches[8] the term bishop or overseer was used. The name of elder belonged to the Apostles, who combined the powers of all the grades of the ministry in themselves, and St. Peter, in his general epistle, exhorts the elders as being himself also an elder.[9]

The general standard of qualifications for the re-

[1] Acts xi. 19.
[2] Acts xi. 30.
[3] Acts xiv. 23.
[4] Acts xv. 6.
[5] Acts xv. 23. See Rev. Ed.
[6] Acts xx. 17, 28.
[7] Titus i. 5.
[8] Phil. i. 1; Titus i. 1, 7, 8; Acts xx. 28.
[9] I. Peter v. 1.

ception of this degree, being so fully laid down in Holy Scripture,[1] makes the inference a fair one that the order was of Divine appointment, intended to be permanent.

This permanent degree, formed to supply the spiritual wants of Christian people, possesses, through its union with Christ, according to its degree of fellowship with the Apostolic order, the powers of the Christian ministry. What powers Christ gave to the ministry has been previously stated. It will be instructive, though, to note the parallel between the eight functions of the Jewish priesthood and the Christian.[2] It will be seen that they are all to be exercised by the Christian ministry, only in a more spiritual sphere and in a more real way. Does the Jewish priesthood, in the admission to the covenant, accept the offerings appointed in connection with the rite of circumcision? The Christian ministry is to make disciples, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.[3] Is the Jewish priest's lips "to keep knowledge and the people to seek the law at his mouth?"[4] The Christian is also authoritatively "to teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."[5] Was the Jewish priest to be the judge in controversies?[6] Of the Christian priesthood it is said, "he that heareth you, heareth Me,"[7] and "if he neglect to hear the Church,

[1] I. Tim. iii. 2–8; Titus i. 6–10.
[2] See Carter's *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, pp. 87–90. 2 Ed.
[3] St. Matt. xxviii. 19.
[4] Mal. ii. 7.
[5] St. Matt. xxviii. 20.
[6] Deu. xvii. 8, 9.
[7] St. Luke x. 16.

let him be unto you as a heathen man and a publican."[1] Did the Jewish priest exercise ecclesiastical rule?[2] To His representatives Christ said, "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[3] Had the Jewish priest the power of reconciliation and excommunication?[4] To the Christian priesthood was given the ministry of reconciliation that, speaking in the power of Christ, "whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained."[5] Was the Jewish priest to go unto the altar and make an offering?[6] We have an altar,[7] and the Christian priest is to make there the Memorial and offer It unto God. Could the Jewish priest stand with his censer between the living and the dead and stay the plague?[8] "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the Name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick."[9] Did the Lord bid Aaron and his sons bless the people?[10] The Christian Benediction is in the power of the revealed Name of the Triune God.[11]

All Christians are kings and priests unto God,[12] but the Christian minister, according to the duties here defined, is so in a special degree. Christianity did not do away with priest and sacrifice. But as

[1] St. Matt. xviii. 17.
[2] Deu. xvii. 11, 12.
[3] St. Matt. xviii. 18.
[4] Lev. xiii. 8, 11, 20, 22, 25, 30, 44; Lev. xiii. 6, 17, 23, 28, 34; Lev. xiv. 11.
[5] St. John xx. 22, 23.
[6] Lev. ix. 7.
[7] Heb. xiii. 10.
[8] Num. xvi. 46–48.
[9] James v. 14, 15.
[10] Num. vi. 23–26.
[11] II. Cor. xiii. 14.
[12] Rev. i. 6.

the yearly offering of the Atonement reconciled the nation and annually gave to Israel the power of offering their customary sacrifices, so has Christ, by His one Offering with shedding of Blood, given to His Church the capacity of offering the yet more acceptable sacrifice of the Christian Altar.[1]

The sacerdotal and hieratic title of a sacrificing priest was applied in the Old Testament by prophecy to the Christian ministry.[2] By the name of elder, the New Testament declares, yet more emphatically, that the Christian minister is a priest. For the term elder is not taken from the ruler of the synagogue. It was a word in use long before the synagogue had existence. It has a generic signification, and "there are elders of cities" and "elders of the people" and "the elders of the priests," as well as "elders of the synagogue."[3] It could not well be taken from the latter, for the elder of the synagogue, by virtue of his office, did neither preach, nor pray, nor sing. It was important in the beginning to mark the difference between the old and the new priesthood by a new name; so much so that St. Paul says, that if our Lord "were on earth He should not be" called a "priest."[4] For the old priesthood was only a temporary and substituted one.[5] It was temporarily accepted in place of the first born, or elder, to whom the priesthood belonged,[6] and it was to pass away when the True First-Born and our Elder Brother, Jesus Christ,

[1] Heb. ix. 23.
[2] Isa. lxvi. 21.
[3] Carter, *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, p. 10.
[4] Heb. viii. 4.
[5] Num. iii. 12; xviii. 6.
[6] Medd, *The One Mediator*, p. 67.

should come. The very name of elder thus marks the higher character of the Christian priesthood by denoting its connection with the True High Priest, Jesus Christ, Who abideth a Priest forever.

The laying on of hands,[1] by which sign the Holy Ghost was given, is the only form revealed to us as the manner of the ordination of this second degree of the priesthood.[2]

We have seen in the Apostolic age the two orders of deacons and presbyters firmly established.[3] But there were two needs which must be supplied; the government of the Church and the extension of the ministry after the Apostles' decease.

Under the Apostles, the Church had extended into many lands. The elders had been gathered into full fellowship with the priestly power, but had been made partakers of the regal one only in a limited degree. They had charge of the particular flock over which they had been made overseers,[4] but could act in decisions of doctrine,[5] and in administration of discipline,[6] only in conjunction with the Apostles. What provision then shall be made for the government of the Church when the Apostles shall be taken away?

And as to the ministry, how shall it be extended? We find Apostles ordaining deacons[7] and elders.[8] We have no record of any ordination of either except

[1] Heb. vi. 2. Acts viii. 17; xiv. 22.
[2] I. Tim. v. 22.
[3] Lightfoot, *Ep. to Philippians. Christian Ministry*, p. 193.
[4] Acts xx. 28.
[5] Acts xv. 23.
[6] I. Cor. v. 4, 5.
[7] Acts vi. 6.
[8] Acts xiv. 23.

by Apostles. In the inception of the ministry Christ was visible and the Holy Ghost sensibly acted, and when Paul and Barnabas had been gathered into the Apostolic order, and not before, could they like other Apostles ordain. We no more can look for a repetition of the same action of the Spirit than for Christ again visibly to appear. What provision then was to be made by the Apostles for the extension of the ministry?

Provision was made, for the Church's future government and ministry, by gathering others into a full participation of the Apostles' powers of government and ordination, and so extending the Apostolate.

For clearer understanding note the distinction between the internal and external exercise of their powers of government. Internally, there arose under the Spirit's guidance, within the Apostolic college, three limitations of the universal jurisdictional power each Apostle possessed. These were national, territorial, and yet more confined or local. Thus St. Peter is the Apostle to the Jews, St. Paul to the Gentiles.[1] Separating into different countries they are careful not to go beyond their own jurisdiction.[2] St. James takes precedence of the others at Jerusalem, because he is the local Apostolic bishop there.[3]

Externally, the Apostle exercised his power by choosing and ordaining[4] the deacons and elders. He takes them with him, or assigns them to local duty. They are subject to his guidance in their doctrinal

[1] Gal. ii. 8.
[2] Rom. xv. 20.
[3] Gal. ii. 9; Acts xv. 13–29.
[4] I. Tim. v. 22; Titus i. 5.

teaching,[1] in their form of public worship,[2] and in the conduct of life.[3]

Seeing this, it may be said that the Episcopate was neither "formed out of the Apostolic order by localization of it," nor out of "the presbyteral by elevation" of one to a presidency. Not the first, for the essence of the Episcopate is unconnected with the extent of its jurisdiction. That may be as extended as the missionary jurisdiction of St. Paul, or as subordinate as that of an Apostolic legate or suffragan, like St. Timothy, or resident and local, like that of St. James. Not the second, because elevation, to a higher office or function in the Body of Christ, necessarily implies a further union with and participation of the powers of Christ. It was, therefore, requisite that the Apostles should gather others into the same degree of union with Christ as they themselves possessed, who alone could ordain, in order that the perpetuity of the Christian priesthood might be secured. The Episcopate sprung from this necessity, and was formed by the incorporation of others, into the fullest degree of fellowship with the Apostolic order, who became thereby partakers of the powers of Christ and the instruments through which the Ever-present Lord rules and ordains.

Historically, its rise follows the same law which characterizes the other orders. The destruction of the Temple, the death of some of the Apostles, parties formed at Corinth under different presbyters, and

[1] II. Tim. ii. 2; I. Tim. vi. 3–4; Titus, i. 10–11.
[2] I. Cor. xi. 34. [3] I. Tim. v. 19–20.

troubles in local government elsewhere, have been surmised as some of its proximate causes. The consecration of Timothy follows. Here again, as the Apostolic order extends itself, there is a supernatural sign by preceding confirmatory prophecies.[1] Is it not, like the sign in the Temple,[2] a witness "for our sakes" of the Divine Will in the extension of the Apostolic order? Most fittingly those elders, who prophesied, laid on their hands along with St. Paul,[3] without whom they could effect nothing, and by "the putting on of whose hands the gift of God" was bestowed.[4]

It was not many years after this we find the order existing throughout the Church of Asia. St. John writes to the seven bishops or "angels,"[5] who are over the seven Churches. The title "angel" was given by Malachi to the priests of Israel,[6] and to St. John the Baptist.[7] That these are human, not angelic, beings there can be but little doubt, for they are represented as having like desires and infirmities with ourselves. They have "laboured and not fainted," or they have to suffer "even unto death," or they have "left their first love," or they are "neither cold nor hot," and one is approved for hating the Nicolaitanes and another censured for suffering a woman, who called herself a prophetess, to teach.

This one officer, in each of the several large

[1] I. Tim. i. 18.
[2] St. John, xii. 30.
[3] I. Tim. iv. 14.
[4] II. Tim. i. 6.
[5] Rev. ii.
[6] Mal. ii. 7.
[7] Mal. iii. 1.

Churches, where there must have been many clergy, and who is held responsible for the Church's government and therefore its chief minister, is called its angel or messenger. The word adds to the former term Apostle, or "one sent," the idea of the heavenly message and powers the Apostle bears. These "angels" are the highest order of the Christian ministry, and are also represented as stars, held in Christ's Right Hand, as He stood in the midst of the golden candlesticks, which symbolize the Churches. They, being human, may become wandering stars, or fall away, but, as held in His Right Hand, their office is seen to be of Divine origin.

The title they have borne in the Church, since the Apostolic age, has been that of Bishop. With the completion of the order, the name becomes complete. It tells the history of its development. Apostles they were and still continue to be. And every living Bishop may say with St. Paul, "I am an Apostle, not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ."[1] But they are something more than Apostles, a bishop is also the angel of the Church; he is sent as a heavenly messenger, shining with heavenly light and power, which he dispenses and exercises as the Church's overseer. This latter term might be used of the elders, for a time, as being the overseers of their respective flocks, but naturally came to be applied to the last and crowning development of the Apostolic ministry, the officer who was to be overseer of the overseers.

[1] Gal. i. 1.

If we may fairly infer the intended permanency of the orders of elder and deacon from the directions given in Scripture concerning their qualifications and duties, it is equally to be observed that three epistles of the New Testament, those to Timothy and Titus, contain, for all time, the inspired directory for the Bishops.

Thus has been traced the development of the Apostolic order into its existing three-fold expression. The bud upon the living stem, perfect in all the portions of its yet undisclosed structure, unfolds itself, in response to the loving urgency of its environment, into the full flower, and sheds, obedient to Heaven's high design, the incense of its worship heavenward, and yields its "leaves for the healing of the nations."

It may not be thought overstrained to see, in the three-fold expression of the ministry, an adumbration of that Trinal-Unit by Whom it had its origin, its formation and its developed perfection.[1]

The Episcopate was formerly admitted, by its

[1] The "seventy" of the gospel narrative have been referred to by some writers as forming, together with the Apostles and Christ, an anticipatory indication of the three orders. No argument can be based on this, or any mystical interpretation; any more on that which sees in the "messengers sent before His Face" (St. Luke ix. 1) a type of the Jewish ministry. The seventy could as well be taken to signify the extension of the Apostolic order. It is not often noticed that "The Lord appointed *other* seventy also" (St. Luke x. 1), which, with the Apostles and Christ, forms one of the Scriptural numerals (St. John xxi. 11), significant of the whole Church, with which the ministry must be co-extensive, "going into every place whither He Himself would send."

ablest opponents, to have been established in the earlier part of the second century, and now a yet earlier date is acknowledged, and the principal agent in its establishment throughout the Church is said to be St. John. Undoubtedly this is true. It surely is not necessary to argue the question by whose authority he did it. The three orders have existed throughout all the ages of Christendom, and the highest is alone clothed with the solemn power of gathering others into union with itself, and so, with Christ, of making any in lesser degrees partakers of Christ's threefold office. The succession has existed from age to age, protected by the Spirit and guarded by law. It is a living instrumentality, the members of which change, as the years roll by, like the changing atoms in the wave which yet retains its form. Living and acting to-day, it gathers men into union with its unseen, yet permanently abiding, Lord. Its successors to-day do not stand at the end of a long line of predecessors, through whom their power of grace has flowed to them, but each new bishop, as he is consecrated to-day, is brought into union with the Lord by as proximate an agency and as immediately as St. Timothy at Ephesus, or St. Barnabas and St. Paul at Antioch.

The point of weakness in the Presbyterian ministry is that the presbyters, who three hundred years ago began their organization and the making of a ministry, had not themselves received, at their own ordination, any power or authority to ordain.

The Congregational theory of an interior call,

certified by others, to an office to which powers are attached, is open to three objections — that the call is not sufficiently articulate to be distinguished as the Voice of Christ, seeing it does not say to which of the three grades of the gospel ministry the person is called — that it fails to observe that the power is not attached to the office, but is a gift bestowed upon the person — and that there is no recorded instance in Scripture of a congregation, or its representatives, ever doing this.

Churchmen can acknowledge and love as fellow-Christians, yet, seeing they do not claim to be priests or to have the powers of the priesthood, it does not seem illiberal not to grant them to be what they strenuously repudiate.

Three-fourths of Christendom still believe in and hold to the Apostolic succession, and it is noticeable that wherever preserved, whatever the defects by addition may be, there is no loss of any of the great fundamentals of the faith. They hold, as they have ever held, the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, the efficacy of Christ's offering as Priest and Victim, the future eternal gain or loss, the sense of the supernatural and the potency of prayer. The loss of the Apostolic succession has been followed, amidst the struggles of the good to avert it, by increasing disintegration, gradual loss, point by point, of the objective faith, its outlines become less and less distinct, till the Godhead of our Lord cannot be discerned, and His Deity fades, and He is only Divine or a perfect example,

beautiful and moving as such, but powerless to deliver from the bondage of guilt.

One other difference may be discerned between Christians who receive the Sacraments from Episcopally-ordained clergy and those not so situated. The general character of the latter's spiritual state is ordinarily expressed as one of acceptance, or assurance, or happiness and peace. Blessed gifts indeed. But to the others, as testified by their devotional writings, there is the consciousness of more entire incorporation into Christ, of His re-creating power, than is to be found in other religious literature. Yet if a Christian may appeal to his own experience of what he has found in Christ and urge others to come and find what only experience can give, so the experience of the greater number of Christians, witnessing to gifts of sacramental grace which may be possessed by those under an Apostolically-descended ministry, ought to be trusted by their fellow-Christians.

The Spirit and the Bride say come, and let him that is athirst come, and, if possessing life, possess it more abundantly.

Do away, O Lord, with prejudices. Remove the veil from off all hearts. Remember not the faults of our forefathers. Help us to acknowledge our transgressions. Heal the divisions of Christendom. Bind up the wounds. Make all Thy children to be one, as Thou art One. Bring all to be of one heart and mind in Thy Holy Church to the Glory of Thy Ever-Blessed and Blessed-Making Name.

VI

THE REUNION OF ORIENTAL AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES

I

HAVING had the opportunity during the past summer of visiting Russia, and, by invitation of some of the higher ecclesiastics of the Russian Church, having been privileged to confer with them upon the momentous theme of bringing closer together the two communions of which respectively we are members, there may be some among American and other Anglican Churchmen who will be interested in an account of our trip, and of the kindnesses shown our party as representatives, though unofficial, of the Anglican Communion.

The late Presiding Bishop of our American Church, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Clark, gave us a most kindly letter of introduction to His Eminence Antonius, the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Presiding Member of the Holy Governing Synod, conveying also his fraternal regards to his Eminence.

We were accompanied by our Chaplain and W. G. Birkbeck, Esq., of England. We visited the principal churches in St. Petersburg and Moscow, the great monasteries in both cities, the famous Tröitsa not far from the latter city,

and were the Metropolitan's guests at the Chudoff Monastery in the Kremlin. We saw something of their charitable, educational, and other institutions, were received and entertained in some of their Academies and Theological Seminaries, and were in communication with the Metropolitans and other Bishops and ecclesiastical professors and leading laymen, and were all received most fraternally. Not only was their welcome warm in words but it was expressed in many acts of brotherly recognition. There was a universally expressed desire for a better understanding and recognized fellowship between the two Communions. We must learn of one another, they said, not merely by books, but by friendly intercourse, "for Religion is not a philosophy but a life." They sincerely pray that closer relations may be established between us and so the outward wounds in Christ's Church be healed. We know that there are many in this country who, with like warmth, reciprocate this heavenly inspired desire and with increased devotion labor for its fulfilment.

Perhaps nothing can give us more encouragement than a realization of the Orthodox conception of the Church, from which their love and longing for us, their Western brethren, derives its strength. Their conception of the Church has not been marred, as that in the West has been, by the moulding influences of the feudal system nor the rationalizing ones of scholasticism. The former assisted the development of the Papal monarchy, the latter, by turning opinions into dogmas, the Papal additions to the

Creed. Nor has the East been obliged to go through the convulsions of a Reformation. Resting more on Holy Scripture and tradition than on rationalism, the East, rejecting Protestant negations and Roman additions, has preserved the ancient faith. It has retained, as the West has not, the Nicene Creed in its original form. Preserved from the effects of the forged decretals and of feudalism, the Church's governmental system developed in the East on an apostolic and canonical basis, freed from the Roman assertion of a divinely granted supremacy. The Eastern idea of the Church is not, therefore, of a body culminating in one visible Representative of Christ to whom obedience is due; but the Church is one spiritual organism, embracing all Christ's members, in whatever state in heaven or earth they are, united sacramentally to the indwelling Lord, while here preserved from schism by canon law and united to one another by divine charity.

It is this spirit of love that makes them reach out to us and desire our possession of it in union with themselves. Hence while Rome's attitude towards us is that of an imperious demand of submission to her authority as the arbiter of doctrine and the source of all jurisdiction, the Orthodox Russian Church only asks: Do we hold together the same faith? If we do, we are brethren. We may differ, must now differ in matters of discipline, ceremonial, ritual; but the essential matter is, do we profess the same scriptural and traditional faith with themselves?

It is at once obvious that we as an integral por-

tion of the Catholic Church do so to a very large extent. We have the same conception of the Church as a divinely founded society and spiritual organism of which Christ is the living and ever present Head. We believe alike in the validity of a ministry, gathered by the successors of the Apostles into Apostolic fellowship, and so into union with Christ Himself, and evangelizing consequently with His authority and power. We hold that there are three orders in this hierarchy, consisting of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and that to the first alone belongs the power of ordination. We regard the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God and the Church as the authorized guardian and interpreter of Holy Writ. We believe alike that the Revelation made by Jesus Christ and declared by the Apostles in its fulness, was not a changeable quantity, but a sacred deposit committed to the Church to be preserved for all time. We believe the Church to be the divinely protected and authoritative teacher of the faith, and we accept in common the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils. We believe that the sacraments or Gospel mysteries are ordained channels of grace; have alike a Liturgical worship with ordered ritual and ceremonial; celebrate in a language understood by the people; observe the fasts and feasts of the Church; commemorate by festivals the Saints; pray for the departed; and keep the Christian Year. Alike we repudiate the Lutheran and Calvinistic errors respecting Church government, predestination, justification, and good works, and also the Papal Supremacy, the

Papal Infallibility, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the withholding of the Chalice from the Laity, the additions made to the Creed by Pope Pius IV; and we allow of the marriage of ecclesiastics. In these and other matters we have much in common.

It must, however, be allowed that we of Western Christendom have not only suffered from the mediæval excesses of Romanism, but from the invasion of Protestant and Puritan heresies, from which the East, by its isolation and conservatism, has been comparatively free. It is of course true that the Anglican Church cannot have a mind or theology of its own apart from the consensus of united Christendom; the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils; the Church's ancient Creed; the faith as witnessed by the Church's order, government, sacraments, and embalmed in her ancient Liturgies. Our Bishops only speak with authority in declaring dogma when they utter the mind of the whole Body of Christ. The Patriarch of Rome, we may also say, can speak with no authority while he is separated from his four brother Patriarchs of the East. We may ask of the East, what their theologians would gladly give, explanations concerning some of the devotional language in their offices and Liturgy; we must also show by explanatory statements that our Prayer Book, rightly interpreted, according to our common standard of faith, agrees with their doctrine, and so that we are one with them. We must claim from them that our formularies be

interpreted according to the declared intention of the Reformers in a Catholic sense; and we must be ready on our part to receive and to put a most charitable construction on all the explanations they may have to offer us. In this way and this way only can we come to an agreement. Nothing is easier than to discover differences, nor more self-deceiving than that it is a duty to insist on them. The charity that unites, ever involves some victory over self and our own opinions. The reunion of Christendom is the noblest cause Christians can work for, and the end desired, the nearest to the Heart of Our Blessed Lord. So far as the providence of God points the way, it lies through union with the East. Let us put aside our prejudices and work for it.

There are four or five points we must, if reunion is to be regained, clearly and lovingly explain to our people, and seek for general acceptance.

First. The recognition of the sacraments or "mysteries," ministered in the Church, as being channels of grace. The Easterns, it may be observed, do not ordinarily use the term "sacrament," but speak of the seven "mysteries." Our Prayer Book uses, in various places, the same term. Christ, we are told, "hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries." In regard to their number there seems to be no essential difference between us. Teaching in her practical way, the English Church in the "Short Catechism" (obviously thus an incomplete one), tells children, as preparatory to the Confirmation, in old Elizabethan English, that there are two

sacraments only "as generally necessary," that is *universally* necessary, to salvation. But our Church does not thereby mean there are only two sacraments. She does not say there are only two sacraments, but two sacraments only as necessary to salvation. This is a very different thing. She holds there are others, for in the Homilies she calls Orders a sacrament. And in the Articles, which are for adults, she speaks of the other five, "commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction." The phrase "commonly called" we may observe, is a Prayer Book expression. It is one not denying that the title is given correctly, but rather allowing it. Thus, "the Presentation of Christ in the Temple" is said to be "*commonly called*" the "Purification of St. Mary," and "the Nativity of our Lord, or the Birthday of Christ, *commonly called* Christmas Day," is the title of that day in the Prayer Book. In both these instances, the latter names are those commonly — and accurately — in use.

There is, however, a difference between these seven mysteries, one which Easterns as well as ourselves recognize, and which divide them into two classes. Not as is occasionally with some incorrectness said, that there are two greater and five lesser sacraments. For in that they are ordained means of conveying, to rightly disposed recipients, the graces they respectively signify, they are in this respect alike. But there are two, as Khomiakoff has said, which belong to the Church considered in

relation to Christ and the Church's eternal being, and others concerned with the Church on earth in its temporal and militant condition. The matter and form of the Two were ordained by Christ Himself and are unalterable; the matter and form of the others are subject to the regulation of the Church.

The anointing of the sick has fallen largely into disuse amongst us, partly from a rejection of the Roman practice of using it chiefly as a preparation for death. Along with the East, we reject the practice of "*Extreme* Unction." But as connected in Holy Scripture with the healing of the soul, by confession and absolution, an anointing which invokes God's healing of the body and brings comfort and peace to the sufferer, is coming to be more commonly recognized among us. It was recognized by our Reformers in the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI. Our Prayer Book does still supply an office for the spiritual part of this mystery. Moreover, our Bishops at their consecration are told as part of their office to "Heal the sick." If this be taken in its original scriptural sense, as relating to the body as well as to the soul, it authorizes them to provide for the healing of the sick by consecration of the *Oleum Infirmorum*, as some Bishops now do. We have thus in Holy Scripture a command, and injunction in our Prayer Book to fulfil it.

Admitting, however, our deficiency in the use of this mystery, yet we believe that practically the

larger number of our American Bishops and clergy recognize Confirmation, the gift of Holy Orders, the pronouncement of Absolution, Holy Matrimony, the priestly special Visitation of the Sick, as ordained means of grace. Taken in this sense, we agree with the East in the retention of these five mysteries, together with those Two which are of universal obligation, as necessary, where they can be had, to salvation.

It may be asked what attitude is taken with regard to our orders. The Orthodox Church has taken no official action, and it is not likely it will, for a long time. But what the judgment will be, in my opinion, depends much on the action of our own Bishops. For the love and good will of their theologians as we conferred with them thus expressed itself: "You have a good case on paper. We are not blinded by the late Roman political decision or its argument about your lack of intention to ordain to the Priesthood. This intention is clearly expressed in your Prayer Book." We gave to some, Dr. Fulton's very able treatise on that subject. "If," they say, "you have orders, and so sacraments, you know it by their effects and the witness of the Holy Spirit. Will your Church, through her accredited Bishops, formally assert that you believe Holy Orders to be a Sacrament? Your arguments as far as they go are good. But you know best. We love you, we believe in you. If Holy Orders is held to be a sacrament with you, plainly declare it to us."

Let us pray that our Bishops will have the courage

and fidelity to say what our homily does, and what Archbishop Bramhall did and many of our theologians have done, and call Holy Orders a sacrament.

Thus we must see the necessity, if the divine cause of Christian reunion is to be forwarded, for us to recognize these seven mysteries of grace which we, alike with the East, possess under the customary title Christendom has given them.

Another subject, which requires some explanation on both sides, concerns the doctrine of The Holy Communion.

We ventured to state, according to our inherited interpretation of the Prayer Book, what was the doctrine of the Church, and why we did not, like themselves, use the term "Transubstantiation." We stated that the Anglican Church had passed through a double contest, one in the deliverance of herself from Latinism, and the other from Protestantism. At the time of the Reformation there was a popular belief known in England as "the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation." According to this doctrine, the elements at the time of consecration were so physically changed that they ceased to exist and remained in appearance only. This the Reformers rejected on the ground that it overthrew the nature of a sacrament, which must consist of two parts. When, on the other hand, the Protestants denied the reality of the Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood, then, in the seventeenth century, the Church made a further and more explicit statement of her doctrine and embodied it in

her official Catechism. She there declared that the outward part or *sign* was the bread and wine, but that the inward part or *Thing* was the Body and Blood of our Lord. She moreover stated that the grace or benefit the faithful received was the strengthening and refreshing of their souls. By making these distinctions between the Sign, the Thing, and the Grace, the Church rejected the subjective theory of Protestantism. For we are not taught by our Catechism that the outward sign or form is the eating or drinking of the elements, but that the outward part or sign is the bread and wine; and we do not say that the inward part is the *reception* of the Body and Blood of Christ, but that the inward part or *Thing* is the Body and Blood of the Lord.

This doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of Christ, as occasioned by the consecration, was further protected by the Articles of Religion. For though never regarded as a confession of faith, and signature by the clergy is not required to them in America, yet they may rightly be referred to in explanation of the doctrine contained in the Catechism which is of universal obligation. Thus it is said in Article 28: "That the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." The same word "spiritual," is also in our Catechism. Here the objectivity of the presence of Christ's Body in the sacrament as occasioned by the consecration is asserted, for the Body to be "given and taken" must be there before it is received. And as to the "heavenly and spiritual

manner," we have both Eastern and Western authorities for its use.

We read in Aquinas (*Summa* iii. 75): "That the Body of Christ is not in the Sacrament in the manner in which a body is in place, but in a certain spiritual manner which is proper to this sacrament." "In heaven, It (the Body of Christ) exists after the manner of a Body, but in the sacrament It does not exist after the manner of a body (in that it does not occupy space), but in a spiritual manner" (*De Eucharistica* V.). So, too, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who in his catechetical Lectures (xix. 7) teaches that "after the invocation the Bread becomes the Body of Christ and the Wine the Blood of Christ," also (see XXII. 4, 8, 9), speaks of its *spiritual* character and partaking thereof as spiritual.

In the 28th Article we read that "The manner whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is faith." It does not say, "made present by faith," nor "given by faith," but "received and eaten by faith." Here, too, our reformers followed Aquinas, who says: "In order to understand the Excellency and Heavenly dignity of this sacrament, it is to be noted that although all the sacraments of the Church have their effect by the faith of the Passion of Christ, and also from faith and through faith profit only the faithful unto salvation; this is, nevertheless, to be said *most especially* of the sacrament of Faith." St. Thomas and St. Cyril are here also in agreement. For St. Cyril says (Lec. xxii. 6): "Contemplate therefore the Bread and Wine not as bare elements,

for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, the Body and Blood of Christ, for though sense suggests this to thee, let faith establish thee. Judge not the matter from taste, but from *faith* be fully assured without misgiving, that thou hast been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ."

Again, our 29th Article states that "The wicked eat not the Body of Christ," and the wicked who receive the sacrament are not thereby made "partakers of Christ." We must note here the two words used "receiving" and "partaking," and their different significations.

The Articles, as is well known, have an authorized Latin as well as an English form, and for the better understanding of this, we must often compare together the language employed in either. Now in this 29th Article, the Latin words for "receiving" are "*accipere*" and "*sumere*"; but for the interior eating or assimilation of the Lord's Body, the word used is "*percipere*." Thus the Article declares that the wicked eat and yet they eat not. They eat because they bodily *receive* the sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, nevertheless, they eat not, because, the eye and mouth of the soul being closed, they do not "*percipere*" — *partake* — of Christ.

Thus our Church, holding the ancient faith, believes in a change or μεταβολή effected by the consecration. The Ancient Fathers to whom our Church looks as standards of authority are full of this teaching. Dr. Pusey's sermon, *This is My Body*, contains a mine of patristic citations. It

is interesting, also, to note how the doctrine is stated in the newly discovered *Prayer Book of Sarapion* of the fourth century: "Let Thy Holy Word come upon this Bread, that the Bread may become Body of the Word, and upon this Cup, that this Cup may become Blood of the Truth."

The ancient teaching is that before the consecration the elements are simply bread and wine. They are given us by God to support our life in the natural order. After the consecration they are what our Lord's Holy and Omnipotent Word declares them to be, His Body and Blood. When man nameth a thing he simply labels it; when God nameth, that He maketh: "Bread into His Body changeth, Wine His True Flesh comes to be." This change, effected by the action of the Holy Ghost, is a divine Mystery. It can be paralleled by no change in the physical or natural order, and is unexplainable by our finite metaphysics. We do not, like the Latins, dogmatize about it. Consequently, we do not use the term Transubstantiation, for as it is used in the West, it is popularly understood as involving the Aristotelian distinction between substance and accident. Fearing to rationalize on so great a mystery, we object to erecting this human, metaphysical conception into a Dogma.

But while, if we used it, we should here be understood as adopting the Roman dogma, we must not allow the use of it by the Orthodox Russian Church, where it would not be so understood, to be a barrier to intercommunion. For when the great and saintly

theologian, Philaret, who died in 1867, translated, by order of the Holy Synod, the decrees of the Council of Bethlehem for the use of the Russian Church, while retaining the word "Transubstantiation" in the sense of *metabole* or change, he eliminated the terms "Substance" and "Accident." Plato, Metropolitan of Moscow in 1775, a great authority, wrote "that the Catholic Oriental Church admits Transubstantiation in a certain sense, not a physical and carnal transubstantiation, but a sacramental and mystical one."

The language of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, as used by the Russian Church, is strikingly in accord with our Anglican belief:

"Send down thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these laid out Gifts, and make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in this Chalice, the precious Blood of thy Christ, Transmuting them by thy Holy Spirit, So that they may be to those that partake, unto sobriety of soul, unto remission of sins, unto communion of thy Holy Spirit, unto fulfilment of the Kingdom of the heavens, unto boldness toward thee, not unto judgment, nor unto condemnation."

The Sacrament is by the East reserved for the sick. But it is not carried about in Procession as is done by the Romans. Nor do they have the service of Benediction, the latter being something lately invented in the West. Thus we believe that the Orthodox Russian Church agrees with us in holding to the sacramental *metabole*, while rejecting along with us as a dogma the Tridentine explanation.

II

We venture to think that the number of the Councils admittedly Ecumenical presents no very difficult barrier to the agreement of the Churches. The only question arises in respect to the seventh or the second of Nice. This Council "received" (Hore's *History of the Greek Church*, p. 245), "the recognition both of Eastern and Western Christendom, which is all that is necessary to render a Council Ecumenical." Owing, it is believed, to a mistranslation or misunderstanding of the decree, a Gallican Synod at Frankfort, 794, rejected it. A full and careful review of the matter is to be found in Dr. Percival's work on *The Seven Councils*.

A very clever explanation was written by the late John Henry Hopkins which so approved itself to the late learned Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, that he wrote him (see *John Henry Hopkins' Life*, p. 228) commending, "His wise and original remarks on the true solution of the Iconoclastic Controversy." Dr. Darwell Stone in his work, and the Rev. E. T. d'E. Jesse's book, on the 22nd Article may well be consulted. Whatever hesitancy there was at first through the misunderstanding or the Emperor's influence, the Gallican Church subsequently recognized the Council. At the Council of Lyons, 1274, all were united in accepting the Seven Synods, and as part of Western Christendom the Church in England did so likewise.

Concerning the doctrinal decree of the Council,

it enjoined that supreme self-surrendering worship, "*latria*," should be given to God only; that reverence and honor should be paid to holy persons and things. It is a broad and sensible distinction and unlike the puzzling Roman subtleties between *latria* and *dulia* and *hyperdulia*. It is also very different, and this is the important distinction, from the Roman teaching and practice. Cardinal Bellarmine wrote that "the Images of Christ and of the saints are to be venerated and absolutely by themselves, so that they themselves are the end of the veneration."

Very different is the Eastern practice from that of St. Bonaventura who claimed that the worship of latria should be given to the image of Christ: "A man speaks to the Image in his Prayers, therefore he speaks to the Image as a reasoning creature, therefore, he speaks to the Image as to Christ, and just as he speaks, just so does he worship and adore, and therefore, he ought to adore the image of Christ." We can from this well understand how our Church rejected, in her 22nd Article, this Romish doctrine of the worshipping of Images.

The belief of the East is different. "The Eastern cense Icons, but they never pay either *dulia* or *hyperdulia* to them, neither does the work of any Eastern divine of authority advocate more than due reverence." In the Orthodox Catechism these questions are asked:

"Q. Is the use of holy Icons agreeable to the second Commandment?

"A. It would then, and then only, be otherwise,

if anyone were to make Gods of them; but it is not in the least contrary to this commandment to honor Icons as sacred representations, and to use them for the religious remembrance of God's works and of His saints; for when thus used, Icons are books, written with the forms of persons and things instead of letters.

"Q. What disposition of mind should we have, when we reverence Icons?

"A. While we look on them with our eyes we should mentally look to God and to the Saints, who are represented in them."

At the Reformation the Anglican Church, while repudiating the "Romish doctrine," never repudiated the Seventh Council, but continued to pay reverence and honor to holy persons and sacred things. She has never yielded to Puritanism or Quakerism in their rejection of the reverence and titles to be given to the saints. She formally sets buildings apart from all common and secular uses by solemn acts of consecration. Unlike Protestants, she, with Episcopal benediction, hallows her churches and treats them by outward signs with reverence. We bless our fonts, altars, instruments of music, bells, holy vessels, and vestments We place the holy sign of our redemption and the representations of the Saviour and the Saints on our Church walls, over our altars, and on the church windows. We bow, according to our old English custom, towards the altar, kiss the word of God, sign our children with the sign of the Cross. By the permissible use of incense in our churches

they are censed, and so all that is within them. Seeing thus that the teaching of the Council is accepted and acted upon, we must, to be consistent, not fail to recognize it. If having, as the Anglican Church has, accepted it, it should now be repudiated, a fatal blow would be given to all hope of reunion with the East. If, they would argue, after so many years of practical acceptance, your Church should now officially say we can only recognize six Councils as possessed of Ecumenical authority, and so repudiate this one, how can we trust you that in time to come you will not repudiate others also?

Seeing, therefore, there is no real difference in principle between us and our Eastern brethren, both alike following, in our reverence for our consecrated temples and sacred things, Holy Scripture and the example of Christ, we should be one in our acceptance of the Seventh Council. No Eastern or Anglican gives supreme worship to pictures or icons, for both alike hold this adoration to be due to God only. God forbade the making of any representations of Himself before He gave us a true one in the Incarnation. Since then it has been lawful and lovable as well by picture as by word to represent Him to the mind. In the old time, God ordered representations of the angels to be used in the embroidered hangings of the Holy of Holies and in the figures of the Cherubim over the Ark. He made also the symbol of the Cross and its victory over the serpent, a means of life to the stricken Israelites. Only when it came to be misused and adored as an idol did He

approve of its destruction. Veneration, honor, reverence, belong to one category, adoration as supreme, self-surrendering worship, belongs to another. The latter, God forbids to any but Himself; the former, to sacred persons and things He commands.

Thus we both alike use holy symbols, and in their presence obey the spirit of the divine commands to put our sandals "from off our feet," to "pray towards the holy place," to guard reverentially the Ark or aught that symbolizes God's presence, to wash the feet ere one enter into the holy place, to guard the temple from all secular profanations, to carry no burden through it, to observe ceremonial details as Christ did in handing the sacred Roll back to the Ruler of the Synagogue, to salute and honor the saints as Paul did St. James and the brethren.

Easterns and Westerns will always allowably differ in their outward expressions of honor and reverence. The Eastern prostrated himself before his Sovereign, the Western warriors of old raised him on their shields. The one, as we sing in our *Venite*, "worships and falls down," the other but bows the head or bends the knee. Our great Hooker defended against the Puritan our Church's customs of worship as based on right principles and the word of God, and we must let no academical dispute or fears of Rome keep us from uniting in this matter with the Orthodox East.

There is another point also requiring, perhaps, some explanation and forbearance on both sides,

but which should not, when we consider the important interests at stake, separate the Churches. It concerns the Invocation of the Saints.

It is sometimes regarded as a practice merely, but it is a practice based on a doctrine, and any doctrine for its acceptance must have the support of Holy Scripture.

The doctrine is that the Church is one body, and that the saints departed are with Christ, and that we, with them, are engaged in a continuous service and common worship. We need not pause to show how this is proved by Holy Scripture and, as well, set forth in the Nicene Creed. St. Paul longed to depart and be with Christ. The Creed bids us believe in "the Communion of Saints." The bond which binds the whole Church together in one spiritual organism is divine charity. Grace unites us to Christ, the Holy Spirit to one another. Love to be loving must, we know, express itself in action; and the action by which it expresses itself is prayer. Engaged in one united worship, we join ourselves to their prayers who are in heaven and they to ours, and so "with the angels and archangels and the whole company of heaven," as we say in our Liturgy, we laud and praise His Holy Name.

Likewise the East in their warmer language say in their Liturgy: "Making mention of our All Holy, undefiled, exceedingly blessed, glorious Lady, *Theotokos* and ever Virgin Mary, with all the saints, let us commend ourselves and to one another and all our life to God." United by the dearest and closest

of all ties, the whole Church strives thus for each other's spiritual welfare by mutual intercession; we here on earth pray for them and they for us. It is the universality of this mutual intercession that so characterizes the East and differentiates it from Rome. The East does what Rome would not. It recognizes the truth that all creatures, wherever they may be, are dependent on God's care and support. It prays, consequently, for the Blessed Virgin and the saints. Thus they say in their service: "We offer to Thee this reasonable worship for those who are in faith deceased, Forefathers, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Preachers, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Continent ones, and every righteous spirit in faith made perfect, especially our holy, undefiled, blessed, glorious Lady, ever Virgin Mary."

How deeply the East recognizes the unity of the Spiritual Body of Christ is seen in this, that they not only hold the saints are not without us made perfect, but that their graces here and their glory there were obtained by the united prayers of the Church, past, present, and future. They regard these prayers as forming one body of loving devotions. They are prayers which were foreseen or rather always present in the sight of God. They all, so to speak, rise up out of the angel's hand before God's all-seeing Omniscience and Predestinating Love, as one united energy of intercession. It is thus united intercession of the whole Church that brought to the saints and to Mary their graces and gifts.

So, too, not only do they pray for the saints, but they also ask of God a part in their prayers. This combination we noticed at the tomb of the blessed Philaret at Moscow. First came the inscription: "May the Lord God be mindful of thy Episcopate in His Kingdom"; and then below: "By the prayers of Philaret, Jesus Christ our God have mercy upon us."

The extravagant legends and direct prayers to the Saints, as Sources of grace, led our Reformers to omit the Litany of the Saints from our public service. But yet we still call on the "servants of the Lord" and "the spirits and souls of the Righteous to bless the Lord," and so surely we may call upon them as engaged in a common act of worship to pray to Him with us and for us. We are all praying together for the advancement of Christ's Kingdom and we are praying for them and they for us. And what we may do *en bloc*, we may do individually naming the Apostles, and Martyrs, and Saints. As the hearing of our particular petition by any saint is not necessarily part of the doctrine involved in this practice, it is not necessary to prove it from Holy Scripture. But as love demands reciprocal action between those who love, we may trust Divine Love, who unites all in Himself, to make, so far as it is best, our request available. No one supposes that the saints can hear us as we in the flesh hear one another. But as they themselves once asked of God the prayers of those gone before, so they know we who are struggling are asking God for theirs.

No one can believe that their interest has lessened by their nearer approach to their Lord, or that their supplications for His Kingdom and His Love has slackened. But we are not left to surmise and argument only. We know we are surrounded by a great cloud of witnesses, who must, to some extent, have knowledge of us. We know also that the angels who guard our little ones and in heaven rejoice over every repenting sinner, can make our requests known, as easily, at least, as our human intelligence can send its messages of love and sorrow through the vacant air. We should not then with a rationalizing Nicodemus ask how can they be made acquainted with our requests, knowing that in God and through God the saints may be made cognizant of them. It was the disuse of prayers for the dead that led to a widespread unbelief in immortality. It is the disuse of all recognition and invocation of the saints that has so obscured our realization of the unseen world and the glories of heaven.

Let us not be afraid of what is true and right in this matter, while careful to observe the right proportions of the faith. On our side there is something for us to learn from the East, and of the Easterns we may ask something of explanation. Our disuse of invocation of the saints in the sixteenth century came largely from a fear that as then practised the Person and Mediatorship of Christ were obscured. This is, we believe, the real objection now with some faithful and Christ-loving souls. As the Orthodox hold the faith, we may see this is not so. They desire

the prayers of all the saints, not as being omnipotent or omnipresent, nor as in themselves sources of grace or virtue, nor as independent of Christ's Mediatorship, nor as having jurisdiction over special persons or cases, but as one with them in the Church of God. The East asks their prayers as our brother worshippers and as the Friends of God. We, on our part, reverence profoundly above all saints and angels the Ever-Blessed Virgin Mary, Bringer-Forth of God, but we are shocked when she is represented as she is by Romans, as the special seat of Mercy, while Christ is that of Justice; or when she is by them made a Co-Redemptorist, or a Mediatorship is given her as the Neck of the mystical Body through whom, from Christ the Head, all grace must pass.

Equally abhorrent to such a view we found the Orthodox East. When, too, we asked of them the meaning they attach to the suffrage in their offices: "Most Holy Mother of God, save us," or others like it, the explanation given was that here the word "save" is similar to its use by St. Paul, where he said: "He became all things to all men that he might 'save' some." As Paul saved by his preaching, so Mary saved us as the bringer-forth of the Saviour and by the aid of her intercessions. We may not wish to adopt their expressions, but the evangelical and living conception of the Church, on which their practice of invocation is based, must commend itself to us. "It is that we profess when we sing, 'The living and the dead but one communion make.'" For "Prayer addressed by us to the

saints, is," they write, "to obtain their intercession, or rather the *communion of their prayers*, and it proceeds in no wise from a feeling of doubt in divine mercy."

"But we know that prayer ought to be fervent, persevering, pure; and feeling our own weakness we call upon the saints as upon our brethren in Jesus Christ to assist our imperfect intercessions. As God is not the God of the dead but of the living, as the Church in her divine universality belongs neither to some peculiar place nor time, but unites in her bosom all the faithful — those who still live upon earth and those who dwell already beyond the limits of this life — therefore, does the communion of love and prayer exist between the Church upon earth and the Church of heaven."

Surely in such a conception of the "Communion of Saints," which is an Article of our Creed, we may find nothing to keep Christians apart.

Lastly, if the two Churches are to enter into recognized fellowship, the old barrier about the "*Filioque*" must in some way be removed. Very few of our laity know that the words, "from the Son," in the Nicene Creed were not in the original. They were inserted in the West, and by the Roman Church, after the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus had declared that no further addition should be made to it. As a part of the Western Church we inherited this interpolated and uncanonical addition from Rome. It is certainly a great satisfaction that between ourselves and the Eastern Orthodox

Church there is no difference in the doctrine involved. Very correctly the East has said that the unity of the Godhead demands the belief that there is but One Source or fountain of life in the Godhead. This is designated as the Father. To make the Holy Spirit proceed in the same way from the Father and the Son is to make two original sources of life in God and so to break up the unity and oneness of God. The great Eastern theologian, John Damascene, taught that while there was but one ἀρχή or source in the Godhead, the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father *through* the Son. Taken in this sense the term *Filioque* is patent of an orthodox meaning. But while in this sense it may be a true opinion, it is impossible for the East to put it into the Creed. The question with them is not whether it is true, but what right has it to be made a dogma and inserted in the Creed without the consent of the Church Catholic? There are a good many other doctrines which may be true but have no place in the Symbol of Faith. This article was put in by no Ecumenical Council, and stands there on the authority of the West alone and of the Pope. The East's whole position and existence is involved in this controversy. If the Pope has a right to sanction one article of faith in the Creed, then he has others. If we admit, they say, the *Filioque*, then logically we should admit the Papal Infallibility and the Immaculate Conception. It all hangs together. It is impossible, therefore, for the East, after their 900 years of protest, to accept it.

How then, we must ask ourselves, can they enter into communion with us if we retain it? There is no Ecumenical authority for it. It is the one remaining shackle that marks our former Roman servitude. May God in His great mercy so enlighten His Church that this cause of division may be removed. If there is a sincere desire for the union for Christ's sake, we cannot doubt but He will melt our hearts and show us the way. There exists in England, or did, a Society entitled the "Nicene Creed Association," having for its object "its restoration to its true form as sanctioned by the General Councils, by the removal of the unauthorized addition, 'and the Son,' and the re-insertion of the omitted word 'Holy' before the words 'Catholic and Apostolic Church.'" In 1902 a memorial was presented to the Bishops in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury saying that "A most serious and weighty grievance" was felt, in that "the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England should be required to profess a creed differing in so momentous a subject from that which the primitive Church through her great councils had handed down to posterity."

Whether the Orthodox Church could, with safety to itself — for it has the large separated body of old believers and others to consider — allow us to retain the words, with a note that they were not to be taken as part of the Creed, has lately been put to them by way of a suggested solution. We Americans once did this, inserting an explanatory clause concerning the descent into hell. The Commission on the

Prayer Book in 1689 proposed to the English Convocation that "it is humbly submitted whether a note might not have been added with relation to the Greek Church in order to our maintaining Catholic Communion." It does not seem needful here to go further into this matter. At the Bonn Conference in 1875 it was formally acknowledged "that the addition of the *Filioque* was not made in an ecclesiastically regular manner." This unlawful addition is the chief impediment to Re-union. We must not wait for its removal by England's Church, prevented, as she is, by the State from taking any action, but the free Church of America must lead the way. For my own part I think the right and straightforward course is to remove it. What is the future of American Christianity to be? Surely in a possible reaction from unbelief and the uncertainties of Protestantism, and in our contest with Rome, it will be a vast advantage if our Church is in recognized fellowship with the East, with its one hundred or more million Catholics and its four ancient Apostolic Patriarchal sees. God grant our Church the charity that puts aside unworthy suspicions of brothers, needless antagonisms within herself, and enable her to lead the cause of re-union. May she gain the blessed title and record of being the Peace Maker of Christendom!

We have thus, it is clear, a great educative work to do before the Churches can be united. It calls for divine patience, divine enthusiasm, wonder-working faith. It is not to be the work of a day or

generation. Our Church is in the transition period of recovering her Catholic heritage. The progress made in the century from 1803 to 1903 is indeed wonderful, and shows how God has been with us. It is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes. If we are faithful, in 2003 our successors will find a like advance. Man is ever impatient and in a hurry. God works slowly, but His work endures. The cause is God's cause, and opposition cannot overthrow it. God will bless in the future, as He has in the past, our hindrances to the sanctification of His Church and the promotion of His Glory.

Let us grow in charity towards all our brethren in Christ. Our weapons are not carnal, but spiritual. Let the sanctity of our lives bear witness to the truth that the possession of the Indwelling God-Man, by the means of sacramental grace, produces a peace, joy, strength, and more illuminated vision, than the lesser and more imperfect union with God by virtue of His immanence in Nature can give.

THE RISE OF RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH

IN the last century Religion in the Church of England went to sleep. It was a period of spiritual paralysis. The paralysis affected her organisation, its functions and the spiritual life of all her members. The Church's legislative machinery stopped. The Convocations of Canterbury and York, the two General Assemblies of the Church, one for the southern, the other for the northern part of England became practically suspended. This was the case from 1718 to 1852. During this period the Royal writs for summoning Convocation were always issued accordant with writs summoning Parliament. The Church met in Convocation, represented by a few officials, went through a show of opening, passed perhaps "a legal address to their Royal oppressor" and adjourned. It did not deliberate, could not enact canons of discipline, could devise no measures for the Church's welfare.

It is difficult satisfactorily to account for acquiescence of this state of prolonged dormancy. Somewhat perhaps is due to the action of George I, in proroguing Convocation to shield the writings of a favorite divine (Dr. Hoadley) from condemnation, and something also to a lack of harmony existing between the clergy and the new Bishops introduced in place of the unfortunately retiring Non-jurors. This latter cause was probably increased, writes Dr.

Joyce, the modern historian of Convocation, "by the secret methods of spying investigations lately discovered to detect the clergy's incompliance with archepiscopal proclivities." To use the celebrated Ignatian simile, the concord and harmony of the lyre, which the Presbyters and Bishops should form, became marred. The Bishops also forgetting Bacon's maxim, that as a material castle so the edifice of the Church needs repair, fostered by their neglect the synodical lethargic decay.

As the century advances, the low condition of spiritual life is recognised everywhere. The saintly line of the theologically learned Bishops who went out at the Revolution of 1688 gave place to the classical scholars of the Georgian period. The King said all his Bishops were gentlemen, and probably they were; but the visitor to the great hall of Christ Church, Oxford, rich with so many portraits of her distinguished sons, can easily pick out the Caroline divines, their faces wearing the purified livery of prayer, and the full rubicund countenances of the Secularised appointees of the Hanoverian dynasty. The patronage zealously lavished upon clergy of liberal views stimulated the growth of the extremest latitudinarianism in doctrine and unspirituality in life. Thus, in this dark age of England's Church, we find along with Clayton and Hoadley's riotous unbelief, a Blackburne running his career at York, and a Cornwallis dancing away his evenings at Lambeth, till George III had peremptorily to interfere.

On the other hand, the physical phenomena at times attending Wesley's preaching, which the good man did not know whether to ascribe to God or the devil, made sedate Churchmen dread what under a general term they called "enthusiasm." Enthusiasm according to their idea was piety without morality. Archbishop Sutton counsels Heber departing for his Indian missionary work to "Preach the Gospel and put down enthusiasm." Moved by this fear of an emotional religion, preachers confined themselves more and more to the inculcation of morals, and got themselves consequently labelled as "formalists," "dry as dusts," and "legalists." The received ideal sermon of the period, as described by Robert Hall, was a "discourse upon some moral topic, clear, correct, and argumentative; in the delivery of which the preacher must be free from all suspicion of being moved himself, or of intending to produce any emotion in his hearers." Blackstone has given us his experience of the pulpit when as a young man he came up to London: "As to its morality, it did not always rise in his opinion to that of Plato or Cicero; and as for the religion, it was difficult to say whether the preacher believed in the Koran, Confucius, or the Bible." Perhaps Blackstone's experience was a limited one, but of a number of sermonizers, the description of Cowper was true enough: "They skipped up into the pulpit, cried 'Hem,' pronounced a text, read what they did not write, and then skipped down again."

Just fifteen minutes their discourse did last,
And so the business of the week was past."

The religious decadence expressed itself in the neglect of Church architecture and in the slovenliness and infrequency of the Church services. The old Church buildings of England were thoroughly Catholic. They were regarded as Bethels, or covenanted meeting-places of GOD with man. In their structure they were like the natural world in its order, embodiments of the Nicene creed. Their three-fold divisional arrangement spoke of the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity; the cross form of the Church, of man's redemption through CHRIST. The Nave was symbolical of the ship of the Church passing through the waves of the world. The Font near the door, of our entrance into the living Ark by baptism. The Choir portion of the chancel, filled with its white-robed choristers, spoke of the Church in Paradise. Separating chancel and nave was often found the open Rood screen, suggestive of the rent veil and the way opened heavenward to all believers by CHRIST. Placed over it as the source of the soul's strength in life and death was the Rood or Crucifix. Seen beyond the open Rood door and within the sanctuary, was the Altar evidencing the fact that CHRIST while reigning in glory was yet ever present with His people.

All this had faded from the spiritual sight of the eighteenth century. Symbolism lost its significance. Worship became a lost art. Like the Puritan who built his meeting-house under the

inspiration of his favorite doctrine of total depravity, the restoring hand of Churchwardens blotted out all the heretical beauties of color with massive layers of whitewash. The interior arrangements of the Churches were changed. A hideous deformity, popularly called a "three-decker," blocked up the middle alley-way and shut out the sight of the Altar.

While in Cathedrals and college chapels the old choral rendering of the service was retained, in the ordinary Parish Churches chanting became unknown. The singing at the Sunday morning service was confined to the *Te Deum* and *Jubilate* and a few verses from Sternhold and Hopkin's collection. The congregation gave up the responses to the clerk and not unfrequently sat during the psalter as well as through the lessons. In the large towns the service was said twice on Sundays and often on Wednesdays and Fridays and holy days, and the Communion celebrated once a month, but elsewhere the services were far less frequent. The normal type of service, with its repulsive and grotesque accessories, has been thus described by the late Beresford Hope as existing far into the nineteenth century:

> The aisles were utilized for certain family pews or boxes, raised aloft and approached by private doors and staircases. The pulpit stood against a pillar with a reading-desk and clerk's box beneath. There was a decrepit western gallery for the band and the nave was crammed with cranky pews of every shape. A portion of the Communion service was read from the desk and separated from the Litany on the one side and the sermon on the other by such a rendering of

Tate and Brady as the unruly gang of volunteers with fiddles and wind instruments in the gallery were pleased to contribute.

The Church of England was in a melancholy condition of spiritual stagnation. Undoubtedly there were some holy Bishops like Wilson in England, and earnest Priests like Griffith Jones of Wales, whose system of circulating schools ministered at last to 8,657 children, and there were martyr-like spirits in Scotland where Churchmen had their chapels burned and the vestments and sacramental vessels seized, and where the English Parliament tried to crush the Church entirely.

But bad as things were in the Church in England they were not so bad as the Catholic biographer of Carlo Borromeo describes the condition of the Roman Church in Milan:

> There the clergy generally exhibited the most unblushing contempt of the requirements of their sacred order, their immorality being in fact so public and systematic that it is presumed they had lost all the obligations of their State. They dressed like seculars, carried arms after the fashion of the men of that day, absented themselves from their benefices, and were so totally indifferent to all that concerned the service of God, that the churches were abandoned to the most shameful neglect.

The English Church was not unlike the Church in France in this century. There, according to Count de Carné, a philosophical and religious Roman Catholic, "the French Episcopate had become like the cordon bleu a mere privilege of birth; life and genius had withdrawn from the Gallican Church;

no protest was made against the *dragonnades* of Louis XIV; no murmur arose at the consecration of the infamous Dubois; the lamp of knowledge was permitted to pass into the hands of the enemies of the faith." It is, however, but just to England's Church to remember that while the attack of the Deistic school was met in England and met successfully by Butler and Cudworth, no Pascal or Bossuet arose to meet the French encyclopædists.

But now at the close of the century, moved in part by the tragic Nemesis of the French Revolution, that first act of the great modern political drama, the spiritual perceptions of Christians were quickened to the discernment amidst the thunderings and voices and showers of blood and vapors of smoke, of the majestic awe-inspiring lineaments of their crucified head and LORD.

As the benumbing influence of Erastianism had extensively affected Christendom, so now, in many places, the evangelical impulse of this new Apocalypse was felt. It manifested itself differently, and according to the Christian environment. Among the Roman Catholics of France, who, with their scientific discernment of the need of a reconstruction of society based upon Christian education, gave themselves, with the chivalrous devotion of their race and its genius for organisation, to the founding of new religious orders. One example is specially noteworthy. The Order of the Sacred Heart, founded by Sophie Barat, attracted to itself ladies of the highest rank and fortune, and, when the saintly

foundress died in 1865, her society had extended throughout the world, and thirteen hundred of her spiritual daughters, having finished their course in faith, were waiting in Paradise to greet her. In America, the Wesleyan Society, which had been organised on lines suggested by some of the best elements of the religious orders of the middle ages, permeated with the Apostolic zeal of its founder, true to its early spirit of poverty and discipline, counted its converts by hundreds of thousands. In the Church of England there arose a body of earnest preachers, who came to be known as Evangelicals. Their spiritual progenitors were John Newton, Henry Venn, Richard Cecil, Charles Simeon. The characteristic of their preaching was their vivid presentation of CHRIST. In contrast with the preceding formalism and legality, the Evangelicals dwelt upon man's lost condition, his deliverance through the satisfaction made on Calvary, and the need, in order to be savingly incorporated with CHRIST and made partaker of his atoning work, of a living faith.

Now the satisfaction made in behalf of humanity by CHRIST as its Representative, removed the barrier raised by disobedience which hindered the free action of GOD'S love towards the creature he had ever loved. The Evangelicals, however, adopted Milton's crude, unchurchly idea, that the Father represented Justice, and the Son Mercy, and the Atonement was a reconciliation between these Divine Persons. But, by their earnest preaching,

they won many souls. They founded the Church Missionary Society. They began a reform in the public services of the Church. Against the opposition of High Churchmen, who thought that only the crown could authorise their use, they introduced the singing of hymns. The services began to be more frequent and more reverently said, according to Simeon's practice and direction, "not to read the prayers, but pray them." Societies of clergy for mutual improvement were formed. The pulpits of some of the most important parishes, both in the metropolis and larger provincial towns, became occupied by men of these sentiments. In the language of one of their writers, many Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and other dignitaries, could now be classed as belonging to themselves, and being truly men of GOD.

The movement was not a learned one. It dwelt mostly on the subjective side of religion. It was in the nature of a St. John Baptist awaking, limited in its theology, and temporary in its duration. Up to the year 1833, it rapidly increased throughout the country. Then new political events began to force the Church into the consideration of other portions of her creed, and a new religious movement began.

GOD seems to mercifully prod the English nation, determinately dull in the comprehension of abstract principles and slow to act except from obvious self-interest, into fresh considerations of spiritual things, by some calamity or oppression. The first

great reform bill, imperilling to the Tory and their High Church mind, the stability of the constitution; together with the Roman Catholic emancipation act, and the suppression about this time of ten Irish bishoprics, compelled Churchmen to think about the future of their Church in the political chaos that seemed coming. What if the subtle solvents of political freedom should eventually dissolve the connection between Church and State? In the prevision of such an upheaval, Christians began to catch sight of the ancient and Apostolic foundations of the Church as a visible society, just as previously, when straining their eyes through the tears and blood of the Revolution, they had caught sight of the faded features of their LORD.

The fact was now recognised that Christianity came into the world not as a doctrine, or offer of salvation, or model of conduct, but as an organisation, with a head, offices and rite of initiation. CHRIST, the GOD-man is Christianity.

As we must be incorporated into Him and made partaker of His nature, to be made a Christian; so we must be gathered into and made partakers of the powers of His three-fold offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, to be made His minister. The visible Divinely ordained instrumentality for our incorporation into CHRIST is Baptism, that for the second is Episcopal ordination. This second instrumentality CHRIST established by forming the one Order of the Apostolate, which ecclesiastically developed or unfolded itself under the guidance of

the HOLY GHOST into three orders. It did this by the progressive gathering into different degrees of fellowship with its own prerogatives, and so with CHRIST'S offices, of deacons, presbyters, and those now called Bishops. According to the earliest known established usage, it was this last and highest order which was so made partaker of CHRIST'S power of ordination, that without its action official ministerial powers cannot be proved to have been conferred. Thus the threatened danger of loss of State position brought vividly to the Christian consciousness, the old Catholic basis of the Church's claim to the allegiance of her children and her clergy's authority to minister in CHRIST'S name.

Hence arose what has been called the Tractarian movement. It was begun by giants. The names of Pusey, Keble, Newman are best known, but rapidly a host of scholars rallied around them. A whole literature came into existence. The writers were especially strong in patristic learning and Holy Scripture. The Incarnation was the key-word of its theology and the source of its holiness. Its motto was "We in CHRIST, and CHRIST in us." We in CHRIST, and so saved by our acceptance in Him. CHRIST in us, and so we made perfect by the unfolding of His Life within. It was thus a fuller, deeper, richer, more balanced theological and moral system than the "believe-and-you-are-saved" theology knew. It was not necessarily antagonistic to the general features of the previous movement, but rather supplemented it. It filled up its meagre

outline. It was, however, attacked with the zeal of ignorance and a love soured into party spirit. In the contest, the sensitive nature of Newman, suffering under some university censure, was lost to the Church. This would not have materially affected the movement, had it not been that a doughty and stiff High Church Bishop, Harry of Exeter, refused to institute a Mr. Gorham into his living on account of his views on Baptism. The matter came before the Privy Council for decision, and the judges, with some ingenuity, having put a different doctrine into the mouth of Mr. Gorham than that he afterwards declared he had held, acquitted him. Unable as yet to discriminate between the utterances of a State court and the voice of the Church, a number of clergy seceded to Rome. Subsequently, Rome in turn lost Döllinger, Haber, Renouf, Hertzog, and about a hundred thousand of the laity, who, in 1871, left the Roman obedience, and took up practically as old Catholics the same position as the Anglo-Catholics.

But, towards the middle of the nineteenth century, the increasing scientific discoveries, and the development of the critical passion for fact, led to the rise of a new and so-called Broad school of theology. It looked as resolutely away from the past as the Tractarian had looked back to it. Negatively, it was rationalistic in its methods, destructive in its criticism. Positively, it sought to readjust the old religious formulæ to the new discoveries of the age. This movement is far from having spent its force.

The Church will always be indebted to some of its earliest writers, to the theological genius of Maurice, the brilliant sermonising of Robertson, the chiselled delicacy of Dean Stanley's thought. There is a long reach between the *Kingdom of Christ*, by Maurice, and Jowett's *Commentaries of St. Paul*, between Charles Kingsley's sermons and those of Stopford Brooke, but they have been popularly classified as belonging to the same school. The book which startled the Church of England into recognition of the new power developing within her was the celebrated *Essays and Reviews*. As a contribution to Scriptural criticism and interpretation of dogma, they were not of much permanent value. German critics had said the same things before, and the Unitarians of Boston had said them, perhaps, better. A contest was provoked. The old, blundering inquiry of the Privy Council was set in motion. By the action of King's College, Maurice was deprived of his professor's chair. Theologically, the school broke with the old Vincent de Lerin's rule of a once-for-all received faith, witnessed everywhere and by all. Morally, it minimised the guilt and consequences of sin. Practically, it glowed with an enthusiasm for humanity. By its opponents it was regarded as the unsupernaturalising of the Faith. It was a respectable expression of growing disbelief. It was religion made palatable to educated ungodliness. But the movement did good, and is still doing it. It created a profitable discontent with inherited apologetics, formerly serviceable, but now

useless. It helped to demonstrate that no dogma of the Catholic faith is contradicted by any recognised scientific fact. It disillusionised men from a belief in the mechanical theory of verbal Scriptural inspiration. By the controversy it aroused concerning eternal punishment, many came to know the Church's doctrine of a future purificative, progressive state, and it made prayers for the departed acceptable to Protestants. It started the Church on new courses of philanthropy. The sword of faith gleamed with victorious light, as it seemed forged anew.

But like the preceding movements, it found in some persons its extreme logical development. Breaking with the received faith, it was led on to break with the historical Church which guarded it. Bishop Colenso's books were condemned by Convocation and he was deposed by the Bishops of the South African Church. Appealing to the civil power, he contrived by means of the Privy Council to hold office, as a paid servant of the British Government, but ceased to be recognised as a Bishop by the Church of England. The Church was seen not to be indifferent to the truth. She was not a Church of good-natured toleration of everybody's views and everybody's practices. Nevertheless she was comprehensive. She held the whole great circle of the Catholic Faith. She had expressed it in her Ordinal, Sacraments and Liturgy. Each revealed doctrine, however, stands related in seeming antagonism to some other doctrine. Truth as it has been said "polarises." This then is the best thought of this

school. It recognises that just in proportion as one is able intelligently to hold all the extremes that shine on every point of the great circumference of revealed truth, does he cease to be extreme, and becomes comprehensive like his Church.

Born of new necessities the Ritualistic movement followed. There was something more dangerous and malefic confronting Christianity than Skepticism. Out of the burning marl of heaving forces, evil and good, naturalism and false supernaturalism, irrational credulity and critical unbelief, struggles between Democracy and Absolutism, contentions of labor and capital, the lust of power and the greed of gold, there was seen arising the developed giant Time-Spirit of the century, with the dream of universal confederated government glowing in its eyes, in form thus not unlike the greatness of the Roman Empire, and in its fire-servant brought from Heaven and miracles of science, not unlike the prophesied final Antagonist of the Apocalypse, which draws men to marvel and worship its greatness and to purchase worldly success by receiving in their right hand or on their forehead the brand which marks them as slaves. If such was the greatness of the evil, a divided Christendom was Christianity's greatest weakness. It was of these necessities the Ritualistic movement was born. Three words will tell us of its spirit. They are, Union, Worship, Work.

The first motto was work, self-denying work, organised work. The old Evangelicals were religious exhorters bidding men flee from the wrath to come.

The broad Church was, however, useful chiefly as a school of literary critics. The Tractarians were learned scholars, defenders of Apostolic order. The three had left the middle classes untouched and had but slightly affected the poor. So the Ritualists took up the work. They strove throughout England to have the sittings of that endowed Church made free to all alike. Some, like Mackonochie and Lowder, in a spirit of heroic self-sacrifice established churches in the east of London amidst the slums of St. Mary's Radcliffe or on the noted site of the thieves' kitchen in Holborn. The clergy, mostly unmarried, lived together in clergy houses and on very small stipends. They gave their lives to CHRIST as men give their lives to their country in time of war. Parish houses, workingmen's clubs, coffee houses, schools of all kinds, parochial schools, night schools, industrial schools, homes, penitentiaries, refuges, guilds, sisterhoods, and all the machinery of the modern city parish came into existence. The Church came into touch with the people. The training also of the clergy was improved. Throughout England new theological colleges were established. In them the future clerics were trained not merely in book learning but in holiness of life and methods of devotion. Societies of clergy binding the members by rule to different degrees of strictness of life were formed. One of these of which Father Mackonochie was the Master numbered about three hundred members. Another society, that of the Blessed Sacrament, having for

its Superior General a priest yet living, intellectually superior and not less saintly than Francis of Sales, numbered two thousand priests on its roll. It takes a volume, as may be seen by the English Church Kalendar, to enumerate the societies and institutions and religious orders which have sprung into existence. Contrast a Church festival such as was lately held at Durham, with nineteen hundred surpliced choristers, three hundred clergy and fifty Bishops present with the services of the Georgian period. More churches have been restored and built within the last half century than previously from the time of Queen Elizabeth, and lives, talents, position, wealth, have been consecrated to CHRIST, in home and foreign missionary work, with such a self-sacrificing abandonment as recalls the fervor of Pentecostal days.

Then as to the worship, like their predecessors, the Ritualists were led to emphasise a certain side of Christian doctrine. And it was now well that one other should be. The Being of GOD had been asserted by the English Apologists, CHRIST crucified by the Evangelicals, the Church and ministry by the Tractarians. But CHRIST has not only died for us, He has risen and ascended for us. His Ascension was not a removal from earth to some distant star. It was not a change from one locality to another locality. It was the being emancipated from the conditions of locality. By its union with the Divine Nature, His Human Nature is not everywhere; but now he can make it appear anywhere.

He, Whom St. Stephen saw standing at the Right Hand of Power, could appear to Saul in the roadway. He could do this simultaneously to all within the sphere of His Kingdom of light and grace. He could fulfil His promise, that being ascended his people might touch Him, and this privilege is made real by the Blessed Sacrament. It is the certified meeting-point between the seen and the unseen and more full of the Glory of His Presence than the Shekinah of old.

Consequently, about the Altar the Ritualist placed two lights, which witnessed to the night of the Last Supper and of His two-fold Nature Who was the world's true Light. Also, in celebrating he thought it seemly to use the vestments which traditionally represented the two worn by our LORD. When asked for his authority for a Service liturgical, ornate, choral, he replied that so GOD had revealed His Will in the preparatory dispensation, and had never repealed it. On the contrary, He had shown that by such a service He was worshipped where unquestionably He was most perfectly worshipped in spirit and truth. For, as after He had led the Hebrews out of Egypt, He took Moses up into the Mount and showed him the pattern for their worship, so after the latter exodus from Judaism, GOD took St. John up to Heaven and showed him the present heavenly worship as the general model and directory of the worship of the Christian Church. There, upon the Altar Throne, filled with living light, arched by the protecting bow of the Covenant, radiant with

all the colors of His Attributes, St. John beheld the Lamb as It had been slain. He saw the High Priest standing in the midst of the golden candlesticks, clothed with His priestly vestments, and girt about with a golden girdle. There, too, was the Angel of the Covenant, offering the golden censer with much incense in front of the Altar and before the great white Throne, where the seven lamps of sacred fire, even in the presence of the dazzling splendor issuing from the Incarnate GOD, burn on in the eternal noonday. He saw the crowned elders of the heavenly hierarchy prostrate themselves, and cast their crowns in mystic adoration, amidst the harpings and hymnings of the white-robed choirs, as, standing on the sea of mingled glass and flame, they antiphonally responded one to another, and accompanied the Divine Liturgy with their Allelujah anthem and credo and thrice holy hymn.

The ceremonial of the Ritualist was attacked. Besides lights and vestments, there were four other accessories, which make up their noted six points. These are, the mixing a little water with the communion wine, the use, for convenience, of wafer or passover bread, the position of the priest on the same side of the Altar as the people, the use of incense on account of the Scriptural prophecy [Mat. ii: 11], and its significance of man's inability to do anything worthy of acceptance, save by the application to it of the merits of CHRIST. In but few churches were all of these adopted. The Ritualists could point to the rubric in their English

Prayer Book preceding the Morning service, which authorised the use of lights and vestments, and to that in their communion office, which, at the consecration, placed the priest "before the Table," and they claimed the liberty thus given them.

The contest is misunderstood by Americans, if it is supposed to be one concerning the amount of pipe-clay which is to adorn the soldier's uniform. As a matter of ceremonial, the Church, if allowed to legislate for herself, could easily restore harmony, by devising an optional minimum and maximum permissive use. But the Church is not allowed to act, and her ministers are being dragged before civil tribunals. It is this which is fostering resistance. For the Church of England forms by itself one of the three estates of the realm. Her freedom in things spiritual is asserted in Magna Charta and recognised by statute. She has never surrendered her right to determine her own spiritual causes. But, by a now acknowledged oversight in drafting a bill, Lord Brougham made the Queen's Privy Council the final court of appeal in ecclesiastical matters. Not acknowledging the jurisdiction of this court, the Ritualists will not appear before it or obey it. Surely, the sympathies of Christians can but be with those who, in the Victorian persecution, are being cast into prison for conscience sake.

Nevertheless, the ceremonial of the Ritualists is not free from criticism. The forced interpretation of some rubrics has led some of its adherents into a loss of straightforwardness. The needless adoption

of Roman terminology has naturally excited distrust. The excessive use of music, and multiplicity of ceremonial details, has hindered devotion. The introduction of the sensational and spectacular element has not been without dangers to Christian character. The appeal for authority to some undefined "western use" has had an unsettling effect on Anglican loyalty. But where, as in most cases, the outward worship has been the expression of love restrained only by obedience, GOD'S blessing like a cloud has rested on its temple, "exceedingly magnifical," and accepted the offering.

The third motive of the Ritualist was his desire for the reunion of Christendom. For this, many thousands of them began years ago to say a daily prayer. Associations of various kinds for promoting reunion were formed. Naturally, they turned first to the historic Churches of the East and to Rome. Towards the latter, Dr. Pusey, in 1865, sent an olive branch. But, as Newman said, he discharged his *Irenicon* as from a catapult. It exposed the uncatholicity of those popularised Roman devotions which hindered reunion. Nothing but controversy came of it. Rome had on hand a scheme more urgent. It was far more important in the interests of the Papacy that its political machinery should be made solid, than that negotiations should be entertained from a Church which was represented to Pius IX as dissolving; and that worldly and malefic influence, to which the Hildebrandine Papacy owes its development, put forth

the dogma of infallibility, and the possibility of present reunion with Rome vanished. But the feeling towards other Christian bodies continued to grow, and found an authoritative utterance in action of the General Convention in America, and the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference.

To this end GOD'S children are everywhere working. The various schools we have considered have done their work and are passing. The errors in each are being rejected; the good in each is being combined. A new comprehensive school is arising. It is too soon to outline its principles or its hopes. In the majestic world work the English-speaking people have to do, it will bring in the coming century its contribution to the unification and development of CHRIST'S Kingdom.

THE RITUAL OF THE CHURCH

GOD is a Ritualist. Nature is only God thinking out loud. He speaks in the truthful precision of mathematics, as, according to the inverse square of their distances, the stellar bodies courtesy and bow to one another. He, Who is not only Beautiful but Beauty Itself, can but join in marriage together the useful and the beautiful. The same laws which make for health and life paint the sky in its sunset colors and clothe the bending grain in ripples of light.

As the All-Mighty, He loves to hide His power. Verily said the prophet: "Thou art a God that hidest Thyself." The material universe is but a *valamen Domini*. As Power hidden as Love, He makes Himself known. So all nature is but a symbol of Himself. If we could understand its inner meaning, the universe would be seen to be an expression of the Christian creed. He Who is the Eternal and the Ancient of Days is yet also Eternal Youth; and so all nature is full of the song of an ever enduring life. "Red in tooth and claw," her pessimistic poetic interpreter may see no sign of love in the blood stains that rest upon her; but nature cries out: "Only by pain and death do all things enter into higher life." Truth, beauty, symbolism — these are the elements of ritualism, and so God is a Ritualist.

It is a bad name, we must grant. And some of the holy orthodox may put us down as profane. For if any term has been a handy brick to throw against any newcomer, it is that of "ritualism."

The Ritualists and Their Critics

"You see, sir, this dressing up of the ministers, and having candles, and marchings to and fro, and ceremonial, is entirely puerile and un-American."

"Is it, dear friend? Then how do you account for the fact that so large a number of our best business men, lawyers, and statesmen belong to the lodge or chapter or commandery, and are Knights Templars, or Odd Fellows, or Knights of Pythias, or members of some other secret order where vestments and lights and ceremonial prevail?"

The fact is that ritual is what keeps these orders alive, and is what American men very much like. This objection may be labeled the hypocritical one.

But then comes the little voice of the little man in the narrow-minded pulpit.

"My brethren, dear brethren, beware of ritualism! Whatever temptations may assail you in the midst of this naughty world, or by whatever blandishment the world with its theaters and cards and saloons and tobacco may seek to seduce you, keep away from the little church around the corner, for there they practise this deadly ritualism. It is, I grieve to say, a retrogression into medievalism."

"Is it?" was the reply made by a member of the

theatrical profession. "In its work among the poor, and in its devotion, it is thunderingly like practical Christianity, and it looks more like an advance into the light."

Bishop Whipple, whose praise as a great Indian missionary is in all the churches, related that when in England he asked a Bishop who was very far from being in agreement with the Ritualists how he permitted the ceremonial of these men.

"Bishop Whipple," he replied, "those men are the only men that seem to have found out that those poor people in the slums where they live with them have souls to be saved."

It was the Ritualists who started this special work in England among the poor. Before the Salvation Army was in existence, men like Fathers Lowder and Mackonochie and others had begun this work. Since then other Ritualists, some in the garb of the Cowley Fathers, some as Sisters of charity, have gone forth from England into every foreign mission field. Persons among the highest ranks of society, both men and women, have given themselves up to this evangelizing work. Said Bishop Whipple:

"When I went to England I was as much prejudiced against these men [the Ritualists] as any one of Puritan ancestry and training could be, but their self-denying devotion in giving up wealth, social position, and life itself, with nothing to reward them in this world but sneers, rebuffs, and persecutions, led me to change my mind."

The argument against Ritualism which has had weight with some more thoughtful Christians has been that there seems to be so little of it in the Divine Master's life. He is wrapped in such beautiful simplicity. He is one among men, and one of them. He needs no ornament of dress, no church surroundings, for the delivery of His message. He preaches from the hillside or the tossing boat, in the house as well as in the synagogue. Where do we find aught in His life of the pomp of ceremonial, the adornment of ritual, the priestly vestments, the use of lights and incense, and the glory which the Church in these ages has gathered about herself? We think the objection a fair and reasonable one, and one that should be met if possible.

Christ's Sanction of Ritual

The work of our Lord's ministry was a preparatory one. He was only laying foundations. He did not declare explicitly, even to the Apostles, the fullness of His Gospel. Just when leaving them He said: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when the Spirit of Truth shall come, He shall lead you in all truth." They are to learn of the organization of the church and its form of worship later.

So as when God of old had delivered Israel from Egypt He took Moses up into the Mount, and showed him the pattern of the heavenly worship, and it became the directory for the Jewish church, so, too, after Christ had prepared the way and His people

had been led out of Judaism, God took St. John up into heaven and showed again the pattern of the heavenly worship. In this way Christ completed His teaching. This was the vision the Church had ever before her eyes, and when she was exempt from persecution, and able to act freely, she took it for her model. There upon the altar throne filled with living light, arched by the protecting rainbow of the Covenant, St. John saw the Lamb as It had been slain. He saw Christ as the high priest standing in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, clothed with His shining priestly vestment, and girt about with a golden girdle.

John saw the crowned elders of the heavenly hierarchy prostrate themselves, and cast their crowns in mystic adoration amidst the harpings and hymnings of the white-robed choirs, as they accompanied the divine liturgy with their halleluiah anthem. Such is the worship of heaven, where God is worshipped "in spirit and truth." The Christian Church led by the Spirit sought to conform her worship to it, and so it became liturgical, choral, magnifical, and ritualistic.

It was not till the convulsion of the Reformation, and the advent of the Puritan, that for our people the art of divine worship was lost. We need not cease to do justice to that movement or those noble men, while admitting that in that great convulsive struggle for what they deemed truth and freedom something of loss befell us. "We buy," said the great philosopher-statesman Burke, "our blessings at a price."

But the resurrection power that is inherent in Christianity brings on slowly but surely its promised spring. Surely we may say, as we mark the revival in all religious bodies, "the winter is over and gone, the singing of the birds has come." No true principles can die. And so to-day, not within one Christian body only, but in all, we see the stir of this new life.

The great principles of worship which God revealed in the old Testament, and which had their origin in His own nature, can never pass away. It was a worship, we know, liturgical, ceremonial, ritualistic, made glorious and beautiful with lights and incense and song. When the Divine Master came, He gave it His sanction by His own participation in it, and by no word or act did He command its repeal.

Humanity's Need of Ritual

As religion is the response of man to God, and God is truth and beauty, religion has again clothed herself in her shining garments and has tried to worship God not only in holiness but in its beauty also. The dark and dour aspect of the Puritans' religion is passing away. Christians are again learning how to make their places of worship glorious temples of praise.

Our old Puritan forefathers built their meeting-houses, and so did the early Methodists and Scottish Covenanters, with studied plainness. Steeples were forbidden. Organs were regarded with displeasure. Interior decoration was out of place, as savoring of

vanity. The senses were not to be gratified, that the spirit might be the more free to worship God.

But the Divine Goodness has given man a dual nature. We have bodies as well as souls. Both come from His hand who pronounced all good that He made, and we shall not worship less with the spirit in worshiping with the body also.

Those who have not studied the condition of the Church in England have scarcely any idea of the condition into which the services and church buildings had sunk in the Georgian period. No better object lesson of the wonderful transformation can be found than in the restoration of the great Cathedral of St. Paul, in London, with its glorious mosaics and great altar, with its cross, its lights, and its magnificent reredos, whereon is displayed our Lord in His triumphant offering of Himself for us on Calvary's Cross.

Every part of a ritualistic service, as it is called, is full of meaning — the altar adornments, the vestments of the clergy, the positions during the service. Nothing is done for show. We cannot now enter into these details.

One thoughtful inquiry we deem it wise to answer. Is there not danger that if we emphasize the outward too much, we may lose the inward? Is there not a danger that the soul may be so occupied with the form of worship as to forget the Blessed Being to whom it is due?

We think this objection well taken. There is this danger. There is danger in everything, for that

matter; no Garden of Eden but has somewhere its serpent of temptation lurking beneath its flowers. But the answer that Gladstone made is, we think, the right one. So long as the ritual does not come in between the soul and its Maker, detain it in itself, it is not harmful, but performs its true office in aiding the soul in its communion with God.

INDEX

INDEX

ABSOLUTION, priest's power of, 232, 239; offer of, cost Christ much, 233; Christ seeks us in, 234; mystery of, 235–237; a food, 239; in God's Word, 242–279; Christ promised priests ministry of, 279–280; declaration of, 281; six things told of God's, 281; power of, inherent in every priest, 283; penance and, 284

AGAPE, the, 143

ALB, the, 17–19, 22–23, 24

ALTAR-CLOTH, the, 7–8

ALTAR-LIGHTS, the, 10, 11, 372, 373, 374

ALTAR-ORNAMENTS, the, the cloth, 7; the fair linen cloth, 8; the cross, 9; the altar-lights, 9, 10

ALTAR-SHELF, the, inaccurately called "superaltar," 5; use of, 5; described, 5–6

ALTAR, the, holy table called, 3; position of 3, 26; screen behind 3, 4; material for, 4; height of, 4; 5, 6; the shelf back of, 5, 6; width of, 6; elements placed upon, 7; celebrant at, 7; covering of, 7–8; shall have upon it a fair linen cloth, 8; the most fitting place for the cross, 9; lights on, 9–11; use of corporal on, 15; prepared for celebration, 21–22, 35; the priest Christ's representative at the, 54; High and Low churchmen kneel at, 88; in Eucharistic Adoration the laity draw nigh to, 190; sacrifice of, 315; we bless, 342; symbolism of, 358

ALTAR VESSELS, the, the Purification, 13; the Pall, 13; the Chalice-veil, 14; the Communion-veil, 15; the corporal, 15; the burse, 16; preparation for celebration of, 20–22; use of, in service, 35–40; we bless, 342

AMICE, the, 18–19, 22, 24

ANGLICAN CATECHISM, the, 187

ANGLICAN CHURCH, the, 78, 79, 80, 82, 92, 94, 99, 169, 172, 193, 203, 207, 217, 222, 224, 225, 228, 229, 238, 325, 329, 330, 334, 341, 342, 352, 355, 356, 360, 362, 367, 368, 374, 383

ANGLO-CATHOLICS, the, 366

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS, the, 17

APOSTOLIC ORDER, the, 67–68, 75, 76, 78, 82, 139, 155, 253, 293–307, 308, 310, 311, 317, 318, 319, 321

Apostolic Succession, the, 288–292, 323, 328
Augsburg Confession, the, 288

Baptism, the gate through which we enter the Church, 69–70, 183; difference between Conversion and, 70–71; means of grace, 77; in the Church, 88; persons resting on the fact of their, 94; our Lord discoursed to Nicodemus on, 95, 96; an absolute condition for salvation, 98; the instrumentality for our incorporation into Christ, 364
Barnes, 96
Benediction, the, 56
Bengal, 98
Beza, 96
Bishops, 185, 288, 289, 303, 310, 312, 320, 328, 332, 333, 355, 356, 360, 363, 365, 368
Book of Common Prayer, the, calls holy table an altar, 3; directions of, 4; does not mention large flagon, 12; rubric regulating use of Eucharistic dress still in, 17; no direction for position of priest in consecration placed by early Reformers in, 28; 1662 present rubric concerning position of priest in receiving Communion placed in, 28; determines position of priest in receiving Communion, 30, 34; directions for posture of priest in giving Communion as given in, 36; orders reservation of the sacrament, 56; discipline set forth in, 83; answers objection to belief in Real Presence, 98; permits leavened or unleavened bread, 203; result of struggle, 224; confession in, 281–284; must agree with that of Eastern Church, 324; speaks of "mysteries," 330, 332
Bread of Life, the, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 110, 136, 170
Broad School of Theology, the, 366–369
Burse, the, 16, 21, 22, 35, 39

Calvary, 4, 93, 175, 176, 362, 383
Calvin, 65, 96, 156, 289, 290
Cassock, the, a secular garment, 23, 82
Catechism, the, 9, 330, 335
Catholic Church of America, the, to Catholic, 11; use of communion-veil peculiar to, 15; vestments mark continuity with Church of primitive times and, 19; does not regard as essential the kind of bread used in celebration, 21; originally stood east and west, 26; has accepted eastward position as construction of the rubric, 29; Christ founder of, 65; He founded but one, 65–66; Christ abides in, 66–67; Christ directs and administers, 67; by Baptism Christ makes us members of, 69–70; re-

quires both Baptism and Conversion, 70–71; an educational society, 71–73; is a spiritual organism, 73, 88, 92, 183; we must be converted to, 74; came into being at Pentecost, 74; the four marks of, 76–77; the appeal of, 80–81; some objections to, 81–87; why unite with, 87–88; differs from Church of Rome, 82–83, 199, 207–208; retreat and ceremony in, 85–86; believes in conversion, 87; provides immersion, 87–88; believes in Real Objective Presence, 92, 334–335, 337; interpretation put on the words of the Institution by, 153; treatment of consecrated and unconsecrated bread in, 187; has repealed rubric that binds English Church to ceremonial of Edward VI, 201; prayers for the dead in, 204; result of doctrines of Real Presence and Sacerdotal Confession on, 219–222; reunion with Oriental church, 326, 329, 330, 343, 350, 353; and the Sacraments, 331; is in transition period, 354

CATHOLICITY, 180, 191, 193, 219

CELEBRANT, the, vestments of, 16, 17, 23; bidden to kneel in only two places, 55

CELTIC CHURCH, the, 10

CHALICE, the, 12, 13, 15, 20, 35, 37, 39, 151

CHALICE VEIL, the, 14, 15, 21, 22, 35, 39

CHANCEL, the, called the sanctuary, 3; lighting of, 9

CHASUBLE, the, 18, 19, 20, 22–23, 25

CHRIST, Jewish Church looked forward to death of, 3; Christian Church built on resurrection of, 3; our salvation depends upon grace of, 9; cross the symbol of our redemption by death of, 9; institution of the Holy Supper in the night by, 9; Communion-veil symbolic of cloth wound around body of, 15; Holy Communion only service ordained by, 16, 18; as the Prophet idea of part of Liturgy, 53; as the Priest and Victim, 53, 323; brought before us as our risen king, 56; the Gospel given to man by, 62; Kingdom of, 62–63; the church called the body of, 64–65, 91; founder of the Church, 65; gives principles, 83; truly present in Communion, 85; Sacraments belong to, 85; heart surrender to, 87; the ever-present Head of His Church, 89; Body and Blood of, 90, 91, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 105, 107, 110, 112, 118, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 133, 134, 135, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 166,

168, 172, 175, 176, 187, 189, 190, 335, 337; the centre of the Church, 92; a sacrifice for mankind, 93; evangelical faith in death of, 96, 97; the discourse of, on the Eucharist, 101–109; Himself the Gift, 104; the donor, 104–105; united by faith and grace to, 106; teachings of, on the Sacrament, 109; Metaphors in discourse of, 110–117; had own methods of conveying instruction, 119–127, 128; teaching the Apostles, 128–137; St. Paul commissioned by, 138; made special revelation concerning the Sacrament, 139; offers the Gift of Eternal Life, 167; object of adoration, 190; is progress, 209; Institution of Christian Ministry, 288, 291, 293–297, 307, 310; and the Holy Spirit, 293, 296, 297, 298, 300, 302, 305, 306, 307, 308, 310; St. Peter the Vicar of, 299; present in His Church, 300; the unity of the Spiritual Body of, 346

CHRISTIAN CHURCH, the, placed sanctuary at East End, 3; God had led, 11; the worship of, 11; wearing of distinctive dress in divine service custom of, 16

CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE, as test of doctrines, 206–214; and belief in the Real Presence, 214, 215; and Adoration, 215–217; and fasting communion, 217–218; and Sacerdotal confession, 218–222

CHRISTIAN MINISTRY, the, instituted by Christ and Apostles, 288; transmitted by Episcopal ordination, 288; departure from, 288–290; reasons for temporary obscurity of, 290–292; benefits of, 292; divided into two parts, 292–307; the work of God, 293, 307; steps in forming, 293–296; work of Holy Ghost in formation of, 296–305; not confined by those called by the visible Christ, 306; not an earthly profession, 306; a permanent and continuous office, 307; development of, 307–324; Christ formed order of, 310; Deacons established order in, 311; the permanent degree possesses power of, 313; to make disciples, 313; title of priest given to, 315; extension of, 316–321; three-fold expression of, 321

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, the, 363

CHURCH OF ASIA, the, 319

CHURCH OF GOD, the, custom of, 10; adornments bestowed upon, 307; the Orthodox desire prayers of saints as one with them in, 349

CHURCH OF PHILIPPI, the, 66

CHURCH OF THE THESSALONIANS, the, 66

CHURCH, the, position of altar in, 3; when altar is large for, 3–4; no tradition as to material for altar in, 4; the form of the cross seen everywhere in, 9; power of cross wrought our entrance to, 9; use of altar-lights in, 10–11; vestments of same general style as costume worn by, 20; preparation of vessels for celebration in, 21; the Liturgy of, 50; the Word confessed by all, 53; is a Kingdom, 62; a visible society spiritually endowed, 62–63; so formed by Christ, 63–64; so declared to be body of Christ by Holy Ghost, 64–65, 89, 91; Christ the founder of, 65; ought to be outwardly united, 77–78; schools of opinion within, 79; objections to, 81–89; in her Œcumenical Councils, 81; Apostles celebrating daily at the founding of, 138; after the Ascension, 139; the worship of, 177–179; is yet one, 184; point to three corroborative witnesses, 184; teaching of, concerning the Blessed Trinity, the Government, the Real Presence, 184–188, 338; appeals to history, 186; teaching of antiquity in agreement with, 186–187; and the Vincentian Rule, 191; has adopted herself to changes of the times, 192–193; Sculpture and Tradition corroborate teachings of, 194–195; universality of, 196; doctrines tested by antiquity and consent, 196–199; Catholic usages in, 201; death of Edward VI and, 223–224; went through a double struggle, 224; denial by Pope of validity of orders of, 224–229; power of absolution in, 232; places no barrier to use of, 240; establishment of government of, 310, 316–321; Elders in, 312; Bishops in, 320; Oriental conception of, 326–327; in East and West compared, 327–339, 341, 343, 344, 345, 347, 349, 350–353;

CONFESSION, in the Liturgy, 54; Sacerdotal, 192, 214, 218–222; Bishop Jeremy Taylor says of, 202, 204; merits of, 235–237; objections to, 237, 238; Dr. Pusey on, 238; increased use of, 238; adapted to present needs, 239; for sick, and dying, 239; our church places no barrier to use of, 240; devotional reasons for use of, 240; methods of making, 240–241; in Old Testament times, 279; in New Testament times, 279; in the Prayer Book, 281–283; in Nicene Creed, 281–282; in Penitential Offices for Lent, 282; in Visitation of Prisoners, 282; in Ordination of Priests, 283; the right of every person, 283; devotional readings on,

284–285; practical reasons for, 286–287
Communion-Veil, the, 15, 16, 21, 35, 37, 39
Coptic Church, the, 10, 17
Corporal, the, 15–16, 21, 22, 35, 37, 39
Council of Chalcedon, the, 17
Council of Ephesus, the, 196–197, 350
Council of Trent, the, 92
Credence, the, described, 6–7; use of, 7; position of, 7; protection of altar-vessels while on, 15
Creed, the, 37, 53, 81, 329, 345, 350, 352
Cross, the, used for decoration, 8, 13, 14, 16; Symbolism of, 9, 343; as symbolic seen everywhere in our churches, 9
Cruets, the, 21, 39

Deacons, the order of, 303, 310, 311, 316, 321, 328, 365
Decalogue, the, 51, 52
Devotions, used in office of Preparation, 41–42; used in penitential seasons, 42–44; used in office of Thanksgiving, 45–48
Divine Office, the, 49
Discourse, the, on the Eucharist, 101–109; divided in two parts, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108–109, 170–171; delivered at Capernaum, 102; on Himself as the Good Shepherd, 103; of Christ misunderstood, 104; analyzed, 104–109; difference in the two sections of, 108–109; two metaphors in, 110–117; Christ's answer to the Jews in, 119, 128–130
Doddridge, 98

Eastern Church, the, preferred wooden altars, 4; use of altar-lights in, 10; visit to, 325; Orthodox conception of, 326; compared with Western Church, 327–339, 341, 343, 344, 345, 347, 349, 350–351; reunion with Anglican, 326–329, 330, 343; the mysteries of, 330, 331–332; uses term "Transubstantiation," 338–339; Liturgy of, 339
Eastward Position, the, defined, 26; the common practice, 28; commonly adopted in America, 29
Ecumenical Councils, the, 81, 328, 329, 340, 343, 350, 351
Elders, the, 197, 312, 315, 316, 321
Elements, the, 6; placed on credence, 7; received by celebrant, 7; thin lawn and fine linen required to cover, 14; sacred symbols, 90; change wrought in, 91; when one is unable to receive the consecrated, 98; only empty symbols, 101, 145; not destroyed by consecration, 140–141; called by the names of their appearance after consecra-

tion, 141; not object of adoration, 190
Episcopacy, 228, 289, 291, 318, 322
Epistle Side, the, 36, 37, 38, 39
Epistle, the, 37, 53
Evangelicals, 362, 371
Evening Prayer, 18, 49
Eucharistic Adoration, a practice based on doctrine of the Real Presence, 190; the Church regulates, 190; Expression of doctrine of the Real Presence, 200; Archbishop Bramhall on, 202; testimony of experience concerning, 215–216
Eucharist, the Holy, belief concerning Real Presence in, 90, 145–146, 187; in St. John, 95–100, 170; miracles proof of Christ's ability to be presence in, 101; Christ's discourse on, 101–109; last section of Christ's discourse relates to, 109; proof that our Lord spoke of gift of his Body and Blood to be taken of in, 118–127; comparison drawn between character and conduct of our Lord as presented by the two views of, 135–137; importance assigned by Apostles to, 137–138; Christ made revelation concerning, 139; statements made to St. Paul concerning, 140–147; the great vital bond of faith in, 162; God has extended His mercy through, 167; in the New Testament, 188–194; Christ enabled the Apostles to celebrate, 297

Fair Linen Cloth, the, 8
Fasting Communion, 192, 199, 200, 217–218

General Council, the, 99
Gesenius, 113
Gift, the, 104, 108, 110, 141, 170, 214, 280, 307, 308
Girdle, the, 22–23, 24
Gladstone, Mr., quoted, 79
Gloria in Excelsis, the, 52, 57
Godet, 98
Gospel Side, the, 35, 37
Gospel, the, 10, 37, 53, 62, 83, 95, 178
Gothic Church, the, 10
Greek Church, the, 10, 17

Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, the, 75, 76, 78, 81, 88, 181, 184, 186, 188, 214, 224, 352
Holy Communion, the, 5; the holy table covered for, 8; deep in the night, 9; lights appropriate to, 10; altar vessels required for celebration of, 12; distinguished as only service ordained by Christ, 16; distinctive vestments for, 17, 22–23; preparation for celebration of, 20–22; prayers while vesting for, 24–26; position of priest in receiving, 26–34; prin-

ciple given by House of Bishops in regard to posture of officiating priest at, 35–36; order of service for celebration of, 35–40; a divine mystery, 50; a close communion, 84–85; we make no hard terms of, 87; was not instituted, 96; our reception of, 98; Dean Alford quoted on subject of, 98; old form of exhortation to receive, 99; Apostles celebrated, 138; celebration of, at Antioch, 138; our Lord made a special communication to St. Paul concerning, 139; to be continued, 139; a brief exposition of, to my fellowman, 164–167; a brief exposition of, to my fellow-Christian, 167–174; a brief exposition of, to my fellow-churchman, 174–179; explanation concerning doctrine of, 334–339

Holy Scripture, the, record about the Church in, 62; the church confirms her teachings by, 81, 94, 142, 186, 194–195; accounts of the Real Presence as found in, 95, 132; a test to doctrine, 205–206; churchman's interpretation of, 230–232; Confession in, 279–281

Holy Spirit, the, double aspect of Church declared by, 64–65; gift of new life bestowed by action of, 69; dwells in the Church, 73, 77, 310; Apostles did not understand Christ fully till after they had received, 75; heart of Church, 75; gift of, in Holy Communion, 84–85; Church guided by, 126, 192, 195, 249; special manifestation of, 138–139; St. Paul organ of, 146; party spirit stronger with some than, 161; atmosphere of Church, 183; the invocation of, 192; speaks through the whole body, 199; interpreter of Prayer-Book, 206; the Church enabled to fulfil her prophetical office by indwelling of, 207; to unfold Christ's seed truth into their ripened truths, 209–211; rules the soul, 237; the Jews understood only after coming of, 248; gift of, bestowed on Apostles, 252, 254–257, 261; official acts of priesthood done by, 260–261; forgiveness of sins act of, 267; renewal of, 268; Christian ministry work of, 293; gift of, 293; Apostles needed also to receive, 296; work of, in formation of Christian ministry, 296–307; made Christian Ministry a living order, 310; baptized in name of, 313; given by sign of laying on of hands, 316; sensibly acted in inception of ministry, 317; unites us to one another, 345; conception in Eastern Church of, 351

Hooker, 99, 100, 344

HOUSE OF BISHOPS, the, 27, 35
HUMBLE ACCESS, 99

ICONS, 341, 342, 343
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, the, 81
INCARNATION, the, 95, 139, 155, 218, 285, 323, 343, 365
INSTITUTION OFFICE, the, of Book of Common Prayer, 3
INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, the, recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, 147–148, 153; words of, 148, 154, 155–156, 159
INVOCATION OF THE SAINTS, the, 345–350

JEWISH CHURCH, the, placed sanctuary at west end, 3

KEBLE, 100
KORAH, 289
KYRIES, the, 36, 51

LAMB, a, that was slain, 8
LAUD, 28
LAYING ON OF HANDS, the, 76, 304–305, 316
LERINS, St. Vincent of, 180
LITURGY, the, the old name for our Eucharistic service, 49; the order and structure of, 49–51; the priest should keep in mind the order of, 51; divided into four parts, 51–57; the Eucharistic, 138, 187
LORD'S DAY, the, 138, 176
LORD'S PRAYER, the, 36, 51
LUTHER, 65, 96, 156, 288, 290
LUTHERANS, the, 11

MANIPLE, the, 22, 25
MELANCTHON, 96
MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION, the, recognition of, 280; exercise of, 280
MORNING PRAYER, 18, 49, 281
MOUNT SINAI, 11

NESTORIAN CHURCH, the, 17
NESTORIUS, 99, 189
NEW DISPENSATION, the, 143, 178
NEW TESTAMENT, the, the Church in, 61; the Eucharist in, 90, 91, 188–194; should be marked, 102–103; My Blood of, 148; or Covenant, 149; the Church existed before writing of, 231; confession in time of, 279; the Christian minister declared a priest in, 315
NICODEMUS, 95, 96, 100, 124

OLD DISPENSATION, the, 143, 149, 175, 178
ORDER OF THE APOSTOLATE, the, 364
ORDER OF THE SACRED HEART, the, 361
ORNAMENTS, the Altar, 5, 7, 8, 9

PALL, the, 13, 14, 15, 37, 39
PASSOVER BREAD, 21
PASSOVER, the, 148
PATEN, the, 12, 13, 15, 20, 37, 38, 39
PENANCE, necessary in some cases, 283; theological reasons for use of, 283–284

PENTECOST, 73, 74, 75, 77, 137, 138, 139, 178, 296, 289, 299, 230, 301, 302
POPE, the, 81, 203, 208, 224, 225, 226, 351
PROVIDENCE, the, of God shown in death of Edward VI, 223–224; of God shown in denial by Pope of validity of Anglican Church orders, 224–229
PRESBYTERS, 356, 365
PRESENCE, the Real, called objective and subjective, 90–91, 94; objections and misunderstandings concerning, 91–94, 110, 151, 153; Anglican Church holds belief in, 92, 169; of Christ in the Eucharist, 95, 187, 214; arguments of those opposed to belief in, 96–98, 110; miracles proof of, 101; last section of Christ's discourse declares, 109; answers to arguments of disbelief in, 110–117; differing interpretations of, 131–132; the past of a living faith is belief in, 136; in St. John we have teaching concerning, 137; Roman Church believes in, 141; teachings, in St. Paul concerning, 140–147; some have lost faith in, 156–161; argument confirming belief in, 161–162; desirable to have wider acceptance of, 162; to-day the Eastern, Roman and Anglican Churches believe in, 169; objection of fellow-Christian to, 169–170; the church teaches, 184, 187, 188; doctrine of, attested by canons of the ancient Councils, 190; Eucharistic Adoration based on doctrine of, 190, 200; testimony of experience concerning, 214–217; denied by Protestants, 334; Articles of Religion protected doctrine of, 335
PRIEST, the, obliged to stand in altar service, 4; should be fully vested for Holy Communion, 18; when vessels should be brought in by, 22; vests himself in sacristy, 22–23; stole crossed on breast if celebrant is, 23; may say prayers while vesting, 23–26; position of, in receiving Holy Communion discussed, 26–34; duties of, in service, 35–40, 55, 56, 57; should mentally prostrate himself before the throne, 51; at the altar Christ's representative, 54; obligatory confession of, 82; powers of, 84; and confession, 218; power of absolution of, 232; confession made before, 279, 281; confession in Ordination of, 283; power of absolution inherent in, 283; bound not to reveal what is told him in confession, 286; you can confess to any, 286; in Old and New Testament, 315; Jesus Christ, 316; in Oriental Church, 328

PROTESTANT, a, 184, 185, 186, 187, 191, 204, 214, 220, 231, 288, 334, 342, 368
PURGATORY, 203
PURIFICATION, the, 13, 20, 37, 39
PURITAN COMMONWEALTH, the, 28
PURITANS, the, and Dr. Wrenn, 33; and the early Reformers, 34
PUSEY, DR., 188, 337

REFORMERS, Anglican, the, use of lights commended by, 10; use of communion-veil required by, 15; Eucharistic dress enjoined by, 17; vestments sanctioned by usage of, 19; of the sixteenth century, 28; a rubric framed by, 34; added rubric to protect sacred elements, 55; altered discipline of our communion, 239; and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, 334
REREDOS, the, material of, 3; space between altar and, 4; shelves or ledges as part of, 5; position of, 26
RIDLEY, 180
RITUALISM, not unmanly, 221; rise of, in the Church, 356–376; elements of, 377; critics of, 378–380; Christ's sanction of, 380–382; Humanity's need of, 382
ROMAN CATHOLICS, the, prejudices which keep out, 11; compared to Anglican Church, 49–50, 52, 56, 81–83; tendency in America away from, 83; try to explain principle of Transubstantiation, 92; believe in Real Presence, 141; of France, 361
ROMANISM, 10–11, 329, 346, 349, 350
RUBRIC, the, requires a credence, 6; requirements for celebration of Holy Communion, 8, 12, 36; fair linen required by, 14, 15; regulating use of Eucharistic dress, 17; position of the priest in receiving Communion as required by, 26–34; of 1662, 28, 33, 34; omitted Litany of the Saints, 347
RULE OF ST. VINCENT, the, application of, 180; sometimes misunderstood, 181; an aid to those within the Body of Christ, 182, 185; error to apply to practices, 191–193, 199–205; divided into three heads, 195–199; tested by Christian experience, 205–214; objection to, 208–209; answers to objections, 209–212; and the Broad School, 367

SACRISTY, the, purificators kept in, 13; vessels prepared in, 20; the priest vests himself in, 22
SANCTUARY, the, part of the chancel called, 3; shelves used in decoration of, 5–6

St. Augustine, 99, 189, 190, 200
St. Chrysostom, 99, 189, 200
St. Cyril, 99, 133, 189, 190, 200, 336
St. John, 11, 95, 99, 102, 103, 124, 137, 140, 142, 170, 178, 322, 372–373
St. Honorat, 180
St. Paul, Christ's appearing to, 92; testimony of, 138–139; set apart with laying on of hands, 139; given special commission by our Lord, 139, 140; statements concerning Holy Eucharist peculiar to, 140–147
St. Vincent, household name in our Communion, 180; educated in monastery, 181; Rule of, 181; sought to help Catholics, 181; did not apply his Rule to practices, 191; quoted, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199; divided tradition into three heads, 195–199, 206; advised the Christian to test doctrine, by Scripture and Tradition, 205–206
Schism, a sin, 86
Service, the order of, 35–40; synagogue and temple, 49; in Roman churches we find altar, 49
Stier, 98, 105, 106, 115, 116
Stole, the, 17, 19, 22–23, 24, 82
Stuarts, the, 28, 227
Summary of the Law, the, 36
Superaltar, the, defined, 5
Superfrontal, the, 7
Superintendents, 289
Surplice Riots, the, 18
Surplice, the, 17, 18, 82
Sursum Corda, the, 54
Synoptics, the, 166
Syrian Church, the, 10, 17

Ten Commandments, the, 36
Tractarian Movement, the, 365–366, 370, 371
Tractarians, the, doctrines of, 201–205; spoken against as Papists, 204
Tradition, the Church confirms her teachings by, 194–195; divided into three heads, 195–199; a test to doctrine, 205–206
Transubstantiation, 92, 141, 334, 338, 339
Trinity, the, 52

Vestments, the, even worn by priest officiating at the Holy Communion, 16; used for Holy Communion a Catholic and primitive custom, 17; consist of three pieces, 17; description of, 17–20; origin of, 19; help to mark continuity of our Church with Church of primitive times, 19; by their firm protest against Romanism, 20; symbolical meaning of, 20; kept in sacristy, 22; laid out for priest in order, 22–23; prayers for use at putting on, 24–26; we bless, 342; which traditionally represent the two

worn by our Lord, 372; used by the ritualists, 373, 374

WAFER, the, prepared for celebration, 20–21; used by Our Lord, 21; used by Lutherans and in Swedish churches, 21; not a Catholic custom, 201; ritualists' use of, 373

WESLEY, 65, 156, 289, 290, 357

WESLEYAN SOCIETY, the, 362

WESTERN CHURCH, the, use of altar-lights in, 10; compared with Eastern Church, 327–339, 341, 343, 344, 345, 347, 349, 350–351

WILLIAMS, ROGER, 65

WISEMAN, Dr., 114, 141

BX
5845
G7A3

v.6

A 001 008 827 6

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

Series 9482